The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXII JULY, 1936 No. 2

THE CATHOLIC EXILES AND THE ELIZABETHAN RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENT

Some twenty years ago, as a continuation of his work on the Catholic refugees on the Continent, Monsignor Guilday contemplated writing a book dealing with their literary activity. Since then, however, other interests and occupations have filled his time, and the book still remains to be written. Even as regards the exiles in the reign of Queen Elizabeth there is more than sufficient material for a good-sized volume on the subject; and it is to be hoped that the historical faculty at Louvain, now that it shows renewed interest in the history of English Catholics, will direct one of its students to undertake such a work. Meanwhile a less ambitious study will not be out of place; a general account, without treating of particular points of controversy, of what the exiles thought of Elizabeth and her government. Historians, it may be, have paid too little attention to these contemporary views, and have been inclined to sweep them aside as of no value; a proceeding which cannot commend itself to the critical and impartial investigator of historic fact. Modern writers, indeed, on particular aspects of the reign of Elizabeth, have come to conclusions which, without their being aware of it, approximate very closely to the opinions expressed by the exiles. At all events, for a just appreciation of these Catholic refugees such a study of their views is essential.

Naturally, these contemporary Catholics have much to say about the religious changes introduced into England under Queen Elizabeth. Among the many points discussed, they emphasise particularly that the new religion is essentially a state-made religion; that it was established by laymen who according to a fundamental principle of the middle ages had no legal power to legislate for the Church; that the religious changes therefore are illegal in their very foundation; and that papal power was not merely abrogated but transferred to the queen, from whom the Anglican bishops receive whatever jurisdiction they possess, and on whom in last analysis depend the determination of rites and ceremonies, the ordering of ecclesiastical discipline, the declaration even of the new belief, and, in a word, the whole of Christian worship. For the exiles the changes signified the complete dominance of the State, the dominance of the lay power over the Church—a view not without its interest to-day, when many countries in and outside Europe have witnessed and are still experiencing the extravagant claims of an absolute State.

Commenting on the proceedings of Elizabeth's first Parliament, which passed the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity against the unanimous voice of the bishops and of the lower clergy assembled in convocation, Allen remarks:

> thus did the sentence of the laity consisting only of noblemen, gentlemen, citizens and some artificers prevail (a monstrous case), and that in cause of religion, not only against all bishops of the universal Church besides, which have (as S. Irenaeus saith, Li, 4. c. 43.) received with their episcopal succession the grace of understanding the truth, but even against their own prelates and pastors.[1]

In the proclamation of the 10th January, 1581, directed against the seminaries established on the continent, the Government had taunted the exiles with living contrary to the laws of God and of the realm. Allen replied that it was only the religious changes decreed by Elizabeth's first Parliament to which they refused to submit, and that these decrees could not bind in conscience as they were opposed to the law of God, and, indeed, were not laws in

[1] *An Apologie of the English Seminaries*, Rheims, 1581, 36. I modernise Allen's spelling throughout.

any real sense of the word, not only because they lacked the consent of the Lords spiritual, but because they were beyond the competence of the lay power which decreed them. "These strange and unnatural proceedings," he writes, referring to the Acts of the first Parliament,

> these proceedings dishonourable to her Majesty and the realm, these laws against God's express commandments which prescribe obedience and subjection to our prelates, these decrees that limit God's constant and permanent truth to the mutability of temporal statutes, to mortal men's wills and fancies; these are the laws of the realm (and not the civil ordinances of our prince) that we refuse to obey: and which not only in our life and doctrine, but unto death and yielding our blood, we trust to withstand. . . . We live not here in our absence from our country, any whit contrary to God's laws, as we be charged, but against man's laws, so far, as it is evident that they be repugnant to the laws of God, the Church, and nature . . . Yea, we avouch further, that as no Protestant divine in Christendom, can prove we live against God's laws, so no Protestant lawyer of the realm (for the Catholics of neither science will stand against us in this point), can convince us, that we live contrary to the laws of our country. Which we affirm, not only for that such laws be unjust, and therefore lightly bind not in conscience; nor for that, that pertaining to religion they passed without the consent of the clergy: nor for that, that being repugnant to the dignity and privileges of the Church, they are against the oath of the makers and of all Christian princes in due order consecrated;[2] but for that they be not indeed any laws at all, the makers lacking competent power, authority, and jurisdiction to proceed judicially and authentically, to hear, determine, define or give sentence in any such things as be mere ecclesiastical. The Parliament is a mere temporal court, the bishops themselves having voice there no otherwise but as barons of the realm, nor having authority thereby or in this regard to treat or define of matters other than pertain to the civil regiment of the state: all the power that they or others there have, being derived from the prince and commonwealth, unto whom neither by the laws of God, nor of nature, the defining of such matters belong.[3]

The points that Allen makes in this quotation still need to be emphasised. That the Established Church was ushered in by the

[2] Allen returns to the subject of the Queen's perjury as regards her coronation oath in his *Sincere and Modest Defence*, London, 1914 ed., 1, 67, 68, and in his *Defence of Sir William Stanley's Surrender of Deventer*, Chetham Society, 1851 ed., 24. Cf. *infra*.

[3] *Apologie*, 37-39.

perjury of the Queen, and by an act of tyranny on the part of Parliament, runs strangely counter to the slowly dying myth, that the English nation in its love of truth and liberty welcomed the new religion as a liberation from the yoke and falsehoods of Rome. At her coronation Elizabeth promised under oath, as her predecessors had done for centuries before,

> to grant and keep the laws, customs and franchises granted to the clergy by the glorious king St. Edward; to keep peace and goodly agreement entirely, according to her power, both to God, to the holy Church, to the clergy and the people; to preserve unto the bishops and to the churches committed to their charge, all canonical privileges and due law and justice, and to protect and defend them, as every good king in this kingdom ought to be protector and defender of the bishops and church under their government.[4]

Yet when Elizabeth took this oath, she was already contemplating the religious changes that ensued. "It is, indeed, hard," writes Father Pollen, "to qualify Elizabeth's duplicity over this oath with the severity it deserves. Taking it in connection with the new laws which had been resolved upon in *The Device*,[5] and which were brought into the Houses of Parliament so soon after the service, it reveals to us a mind whose perfidy and cruelty it would be hard to equal." English writers, it may be added, usually preserve a discreet silence as regards this perjury of Elizabeth.

Moreover, though Anglican historians mention the opposition voiced by the bishops and clergy in Parliament and in Convocation, they fail to observe its significance. It is a modern non-Catholic writer who has remarked on this inadvertence. "It is a fact," writes G. W. Child, "to which modern historians of the English Church do not frequently draw attention, that the only Convocation during the earlier Reformation period which was evidently elected without pressure from the Government, and which

[4] It is agreed that the coronation of Elizabeth was carried out according to the rite prescribed in the Liber Regalis. A translation of the oath contained therein is given in *The Coronation Ceremonial*, by H. Thurston, S. J., London, 1914, from which the above phrases are cited.

[5] *The Device for the Alteration of Religion*, printed in Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, Oxford, 1820.

was the freely chosen representative of the clergy of England, should thus have declared its opinion, to all appearance unanimously, in favour of the Roman faith and the Roman obedience." Dixon, however, the Anglican historian, acknowledges that the illegality which lies at the very foundation of the Established Church, was recognised at the time by Elizabethan lawyers. "The doctors of civil law," he writes, "made opposition to the deprivation of the (Catholic) bishops, as soon as it was begun, on the ground that they could not be deprived for disobeying a law whose adoption and promulgation they had always resisted, and which was made in opposition to the whole ecclesiastical body." [6] Frere, too, acknowledges the illegality, but justifies it, apparently, on the ground of its success. "A religious revolution," he declares, "like any other revolution, must risk technical illegalities, and be content to do exceptional things in the confidence that the event will justify them!" [7] To speak of it, however, as a mere technical illegality is to minimise the revolutionary character of the proceeding, and is quite misleading. Allen in the passage cited above was not referring to a mere technical illegality, but to the breach of a fundamental principle recognised and acted upon throughout the middle ages, the principle, namely, that the laity may not legislate for the Church. This, indeed, was clearly recognised by the late H. W. C. Davis, a historian well qualified to speak by his knowledge of medieval history. Referring to the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, he writes:

> The Tudors were perhaps on safer ground when they tried to popularise a new conception of the National Church as a community which was represented for all persons by the Sovereign, and for which the Sovereign could legislate at his pleasure, using the assistance either of Parliament or of representative assemblies of the Clergy. On such a theory the Acts

[6] *History of the Church in England*, Oxford, 1902, V, 124. Cf. Quadra to Philip II, 19 June, 1559, *Spanish Calendar*, 76, and Pollen, "A Flaw in the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion," *Month*, October, 1902, 428 ff. Bonner when called upon to take the oath of Supremacy by Horne, the Protestant Bishop of Winchester, alleged this illegality as one reason for his refusal to do so.

[7] Frere, *The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I*, London, 1904, 39. But if it was a *revolution*, we may ask, what then becomes of the theory of continuity?

of Uniformity and Supremacy, for instance, could be represented as acts of the English Church. Ever since the Reformation it has been the tendency of Anglican historians to carry this new conception of the Church into the medieval period. The ordinary English Churchman, we are told, was better represented by the king and Parliament than by the archbishops and their provincial synods. It was the English Church which in effect issued such measures as the Statutes of Praemunire and Provisors. But such a view of the situation is *contrary to the most fundamental ideas of the Middle Ages on the subject of Church government.* The English clergy repeatedly protested against the Statute of Praemunire, by which they benefited as much as the laity. They were bound to do so. Whatever anomalies they might be compelled to endure for the sake of peace, *they could not accept the principle that the laity may legislate for the Church. The laity can neither make nor abrogate the canon law.*[7]

It was the breach of this fundamental principle to which Allen referred, not to a mere technical illegality.

Parliament, then, according to Allen, in itself has no power to pass the Act of Supremacy. But cannot the prince confer such power on Parliament? No, he replies, for the prince himself has it not; ecclesiastical supremacy, the supreme government of the Church is no part of royal sovereignty. His argument, though ultimately based on the fact that the constitution of the Church is not of man's but of God's appointment, fixed and determined by Christ himself, is interesting in the way he presents it. Such power, he asserts, cannot in the first place belong to the crown of an heathen prince,

> forasmuch as four hundred years after (the foundation of Christendom) there were not many princes converted to Christ, and yet all that while the Church had her several regiment. Not to pagan emperors, then, did it belong (though they were no less imperial and kingly than now) neither was it challenged of them: for the principal Apostles ruled the Church in Rome, when Nero reigned: likewise where the kingdoms are revolted again (as in all the Turk's dominion) needs must the Church have a spiritual regiment without dependence on the heathen kings: whom yet in temporal matters they obey and serve. And therefore all that the Protestants allege out of scriptures, make no more for the claim of a Christian prince, than for the right of the heathen.
>
> Again not to the crown of kings and kingdoms, in that they be Christians;

[7a] "Canon Law in England," reprinted in Henry William Careless Davis, *A Memoir*, by J. R. Weaver, 133. Italics inserted.

for then the Church which is Christ's mystical body or commonwealth, matching and meeting with a terrene or earthly state, should forsake her proper regiment, jurisdiction, and form of government received immediately of Christ, and yield the same and itself to the earthly power which the Apostle calleth humanam creaturam. By which means, whensoever a king or country is converted, the Church should come and submit to them, and not they to Christ and his Church, which must needs be most absurd: princes and people converted, always submitting themselves to Christ and his laws, not drawing the Governors of the Church or any person thereof to more subjection than they were before their Christianity, yea often rather remitting some of that for Christ's honour. . . . Kings by receiving Christ's religion are not become Christ's masters, or lords over the Church as it is his spiritual and mystical commonweath. . . .

The Church, then, live she among the heathens, live she with the Christians, must have and hold that form of regiment and commonwealth which Christ immediately instituted, and was not chosen made or created by the people's ordinance and consent (which is the origin of all other human states and forms of polity) the Holy Ghost perpetually assisting, protecting, and propagating the said spiritual regiment in all degrees and functions, as in Apostles, bishops, priests and the rest to the end of the world, . . . This regiment is not the right of any earthly crown, prince or state: they all, if they be Christians, owing subjection to the pastors of their souls and unto the Church of Christ. The Church never yielded it, nor can yield it unto them. It is not agreeable to them by nature, as we see in the heathen: it cannot be challenged by their Christianity, by which themselves are bound to obey the Church and may not command it: no earthly commonwealth can give it to their prince because they cannot give that which they have not by any natural faculty. The prince, therefore, neither taking it of the people, nor having it by birth or otherwise, cannot communicate it to Parliament, and consequently cannot possibly make laws, hear or determine by himself, Parliament, or any other court in such sort subject to him, of the Church's regiment.

And strange it is (especially in that first assembly of the States) how they could attempt to bring the Church's spiritual and proper regiment into consultation, judicial cognition, and deliberation, before the prince or themselves were found lawful judges in such cases: no statute then that stood in force, granting them any such power, nor no such thing any way lawful otherwise than by false supposition of the prince's ecclesiastical supremacy, which yet was not by laws (nor in truth by nature could be) agnised before the determination thereof in Parliament. Which having no legal means to deliberate of the matter, could much less give sentence for it.[8]

[8] *Apologie*, 37-42.

Such, then, is Allen's argument to show that the fundamental laws of this new state-made religion are in reality no laws, not merely because they are against the laws of God, or because they lacked the consent of the Lords spiritual, but because they are *ultra vires*, quite beyond the competence of the laymen who decreed them.

Allen's views, of course, were not peculiar to him. Some ten years after Allen's *Apologie* saw the light, another exile, the celebrated theologian, Thomas Stapleton, in answer to the proclamation of 1591, again emphasised the state-made character of the new religion. By the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, he declared, Elizabeth "transferred all questions of faith to the civil power: she confounded words and the very nature of things, and by an impious mingling of secular with spiritual jurisdiction brought forth a foul monster, a sort of half man, half beast. Hence it came about that no one henceforth could offer resistance to her spiritual power without being held guilty of treason. Thus in the place of the most holy worship of God she obtruded a civil cult based entirely on the authority of the queen, a new golden statue to be adored by all." He writes later:

> What boots it to speak of ecclesiastics? There is no place left them in the English State. For if there arise any question concerning belief, the sacraments, ceremonies, the whole Christian worship or ecclesiastical discipline, the controversy is no longer as of old referred to priests and bishops, or if the matter required greater investigation, to a provincial or general council, but—God help us!—to Parliament. It is left, that is, to the votes of laymen, and these by far the greatest part, unlearned, whose votes, however, are of not the slightest account in deciding anything unless there be added the approbation and command, according to the spiritual power she enjoys, of the Queen Pope. However, no injury is done thereby to her ecclesiastics, for though they counterfeit the name and appearance of bishops and minister, they have no power and jurisidction, seeing that all that they enjoy in this respect, they have received not from the Apostles and their successors, but from the secular prince and hold it in dependence on his good will and pleasure. And if at times they determine anything in matters of belief, they do so as the Queen's deputies, or should they be bishops, as barons of the realm with the rest of the Lords.[9]

[9] Stapleton, *Apologia pro Rege Catholico, Philippo II*, Constance, 1592, 15, 23, 24. Cf. also 197, where he shows the extent of the royal supremacy.

Stapleton was expressing the truth. The Act of Supremacy passed by the laity signified the dominance of the State, the dominance of the lay power over the Church.[10] Far from being an act of liberation, it was an act of enslavement. "The Church of England," writes G. W. Child, "is thus seen to be the creature of the State and to be in all things subject, in Tudor times at least, to the personal government of the sovereign, and as completely under Elizabeth as under Henry or Edward . . . The Church was, as I have said, incorporated with it: and how complete this subjection was and how it was accepted in all good faith by the divines and functionaries of Elizabeth, may be seen by reference to contemporary records whether official or private." [11]

Stapleton's phrase, the Queen Pope, *Regina Pont. Max.*, is no exaggeration. It is echoed by the modern non-Catholic writer just cited, when he writes of Henry and his successors in revolt: "Pope of England he was and Pope of England he remained, and so did his successors after him; and though Edward, from the necessity of his age, and Elizabeth from a certain sense of personal dignity, and the fitness of things, placed their papal authority, if I may say so, in commission, neither of them dreamed of abdicating it." So much emphasis is laid upon the abrogation of papal power that one is apt to forget that this is only the negative aspect of the religious changes: papal power was not merely abrogated, it was annexed to the crown. For the pope was substituted the monarch.[12]

That this was so, is clear enough from the Act of Supremacy itself, where after abolishing all foreign jurisdiction, that is, the

[10] Cf. W. F. Finlason in his edition of Reeve's *History of English Law*, London, 1869, III, 214. Another and more sordid aspect of the dominance of the lay power is the control of the benefices by laymen. In 1604 the Anglican bishops declared that five-sixths of all the benefices of the realm were controlled by the laity. Cf. R. G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, London, 1910, I, 95, and III, 112.

[11] *Church and State under The Tudors*, London, 1890, 205, 246. Cf. Usher, *op. cit.*, 96.

[12] Cf. Finlason, *op. cit.*, III, 573; Pollard, *Political History of England*, London, 1910, VI, 355; and J. W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, London, 1928, cc. IV and V.

papal, it declares annexed to the imperial crown of this realm "such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities and preeminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been or may lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesastical state and persons and for all reformation, order, and correction of the same and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities." Elizabeth, moreover, distinctly declared that she challenged no other authority than that "challenged and lately used by the same noble kings of famous memory, King Henry the Eighth, and King Edward the Sixth:" [13] and what Henry claimed, as Professor Holdsworth has pointed out, was "all that 'usurped' authority which once belonged to the pope." [14]

Such too, was the interpretation of the judges in Elizabeth's reign. The question was raised "whether the queen, by the statute 25 Henry VIII, having that supremacy united to the crown which the pope, it was said, had usurped, could grant dispensations, which the archbishop could *not* grant! And it was resolved by the court that the queen *could* grant dispensations as the pope could do in cases where the archbishop had no authority by the statute to do so, *because all the authority which the pope had is given to the crown,* "quia tout authority quel le pape asoit est donc al corone." [15]

Elizabethan Anglican churchmen so understood the Act. Bancroft, who later became successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of Canterbury, openly acknowledged it in his sermon at St. Paul's Cross in 1588. In his attack on bishops Martin Marprelate had put forth the argument "no petty Popes ought to be maintained or tolerated in any Christian commonwealth; but our Archbishops and Lord Bishops are petty Popes, therefore they ought not be maintained or tolerated." Bancroft replied:

[13] "An Admonition to simple men deceived by the malicious," 1559, Cardwell, *Documentary Annals*, Oxford, 1839, I, 261.

[14] Holdsworth, *A History of English Law*, 4th ed., London, 1922, I, 591.

[15] Finlason, *op. cit.*, 217, citing Moore's *Reports*, 542. Cf. also the *Penal Laws against Papists and Popish Recusants, Nonconformists and Nonjurors*, by a Protestant lawyer, London, 1723, 4, where the author explains the extent of the Elizabethan Act of Supremacy in this sense.

Why stayed he there? Upon this principle a man may frame this rebellious argument; No petty Pope is to be tolerated in a Christian commonwealth; but her Majesty is a petty Pope: therefore her Majesty is not to be tolerated in a Christian commonwealth. And his minor may thus be proved: Whosoever do take upon them or usurp the same authority in causes ecclesiastical within their dominions which the Pope had, they are petty Popes: But her Majesty doeth so. Therefore her Majesty is a petty Pope and so consequently not to be tolerated.

And that there should be no doubt about the minor, he continues:

When it pleased Almighty God to deliver this realm from the bondage and thraldom of the Bishop of Rome, it was thought agreeable to the word of God by the Chiefest and best learned men of the religion in all Christendom, that not only the title of supreme governor over all persons and in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil, did appertain and ought to be annexed to the crown, but likewise all honours, dignities, preeminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits and commodities which by usurpation at any time did appertain to the Pope.[16]

A more explicit declaration as to what was understood by the royal supremacy could hardly be desired. By the Act of Supremacy, in fact, Elizabeth became Pope of England.

Equally correct was Stapleton's assertion that even questions of belief depended on Parliament and ultimately, in virtue of her supremacy, on the queen. His view is endorsed by J. W. Allen, a modern authority on political thought in the sixteenth century. "Royal Supremacy," Allen declares, "need not mean the supremacy of the king simply; but it must mean a right to decide all doctrinal questions or it meant nothing at all." He points out, too, that this was clearly recognised even in Henry VIII's reign by St. Germain, and that this Protestant lawyer did but anticipate the view officially adopted under Elizabeth.[17] Whitgift, indeed, who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583, clearly under-

[16] *A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse*, London, 1588, 67-70.

[17] J. W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, London, 1928, p. 168. Elizabeth, however, in practice considered all religious questions to belong to her royal prerogative and not within the competence of Parliament except in so far as she graciously allowed its members to discuss them. Cf. *infra*. Allen, it seems to me, is inclined to overlook this.

stood royal supremacy in this sense. Treating of the prince's right in ecclesiastical matters, he declared in answer to Cartwright: "The continued practice of Christian Churches in the time of Christian magistrates, before the usurpation of the Bishop of Rome, hath been to give to Christian princes supreme authority in making ecclesiastical orders and laws, yea, and that which is more, in deciding matters of religion, even in the chief and principal points." [18] "What," asks J. W. Allen, "can be 'the chief and principal points' if not the articles of faith?" [19] The context itself, in fact of the passage cited makes this sufficiently clear; but even if it were not so, all doubt as to his meaning is removed by a document printed in Strype's life of the Elizabethan archbishop. It is headed: "A paper of arguments for the Queen's supreme power in ecclesiastical causes," and sections three and nine impart the information that Christian kings "made ordinances concerning points of faith," and "made laws concerning the *Trinity, the person, nature, and offices of Jesus Christ.*" [20] Whitgift's history may be poor stuff—and it would be difficult not to qualify it as such—but there can be no doubt as to what he understood to be involved in the royal supremacy.[21] Doubtless, the queen in so determining the faith was bound by the text of Scripture. Yet, as Allen points out,

> if you accepted the Elizabethan system, you could not deny that it was for the Queen, or for the Queen in Parliament, to declare authoritatively what doctrines and what sacraments are indeed in Scripture. . . . Constant repetition of the assertion that the sovereign is bound by Scripture served

---

[18] *The Defence of the Answer to the Admonition.* Whitgift's *Works*, Parker Society, 1851-1853, III, 306.

[19] J. W. Allen, *op. cit.*, 174.

[20] Strype, *Life of Whitgift*, Oxford, 1828 ed., III, 214, 215. Italics as in Strype.

[21] With the Revolution of 1688 the Supremacy of the crown over the Anglican Church passed to Parliament, and ultimately with the growth of the cabinet government to the ministry of the day. (Holdsworth, *A History of English Law*, 4th ed. I, 597.) The cabinet, however, may at times make questions of belief and practice in the Anglican Church non-party questions, as, in fact, was the case in the recent Prayer-book controversy. But it was Parliament, not the Anglican bishops or Convocation, that decided the matter.

but as an anodyne for the conscience. It should have served for nothing, since, in the last resort, it was for Parliament to interpret Scripture.[22]

This power of the queen to determine the faith and the right to impose on her subjects under the severest penalties what she had so determined, involved, as the same writer acutely remarks, "either the belief that queen or Parliament could pronounce infallibly on the articles of faith or the belief that one was in duty bound to accept their pronouncements and act on them right or wrong." [23]

Nor was this royal papal supremacy a mere empty honour, a shadow without the substance. The queen asserted it throughout her reign; in virtue of it she claimed all matters touching religion to come within her prerogative and to be outside the province of Parliament, unless she graciously accorded them permission to deal with them. When a bill, for instance, concerning religion had passed the Commons and was sent to the Upper House, an answer was returned "that the Queen's Majesty having been made privy to the said articles, liketh very well of them; and mindeth to publish them, and have them executed by the bishops, by the direction of her Highness' regal authority of Supremacy of the Church of England, and not to have the same dealt in by Parliament." [24] There is hardly a Parliament during the whole course of her reign in which she does not assert in virtue of her supremacy this principle of her prerogative in affairs of religion, and interfere with the proceedings therein.[25] Parliament, indeed, ack-

[22] *Op. cit*, 172, 179. It would have been more accurate, I think, to have written: "since in the last resort, it was for the Queen to interpret Scripture, or for Parliament only in so far as the Queen permitted." "The supreme head of the Church," writes Professor Pollard of Henry VIII, "was not to be subject to parliamentary conditions in the exercise of his supremacy; and the ecclesiastical sovereign was to be the crown in council and not the crown in parliament." (*The Evolution of Parliament*, London, 2nd ed., 1926, 268.) The same applied to Elizabeth. Religious questions came under her royal prerogative.

[23] *Ibid.*, 175.

[24] D'Ewes, *Journal of all the Parliaments during the reign of Queen Elizabeth*, London, 1682, 180.

[25] Cf. D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, 140, 160, 184, 185, 213, 236-244, 345, 410, 411, 478, 479, 557, 558, and Pollard, *op. cit.*, 263, 266, 362, 363, 366, 458, 461, 463, 469, 478, 479.

nowledged the principle; and if at times individual members showed a tendency to question it, they paid for their temerity in the Tower. So it befell Strickland, Wentworth, Coke, Lewknor and others.

The religious changes themselves were established and enforced by Royal Injunctions and Advertisements and by the issue of High Commissions to hear ecclesiastical causes, in which, though the clergy were represented, the majority of the commissioners were laymen. Five of these commissions were issued before the erection of the permanent court of that name.[26] The Statute, 1 Eliz. c. 1., indeed, gave a statutory basis for the issue of such commissions, but as that statute purported—though erroneously—to restore to the crown the ancient jurisdiction "usurped by the bishop of Rome," it was considered not as introducing new law, but as declaratory of the old. The judges, accordingly, in Caudrey's case, in 1591, declared "that the king or queen of England for the time being may make such ecclesiastical commissions as before mentioned by the ancient prerogative and law of England." By virtue, that is, of the royal supremacy alone, without particular statutory authority, the queen could delegate to commissioners, and laymen at that, the fullest ecclesiastical jurisdiction. "The prerogative," [27] remarks Sir J. F. Stephen, "was probably never carried higher than by the creation of this formidable court, and the proceedings which took place under the authority conferred upon it by its commission." [28]

Convocation itself, of which the upper house was entirely and the lower largely an assembly of royal nominees, recognised its subjection. In 1562 it obtained the queen's permission to revise the Articles of Religion: to the revised Articles its members subsequently subscribed their names, but cautiously added at the end, "for fear (as it seems) of a praemunire: ista subscriptio facta est ab omnibus sub hac protestatione, quod nihil statuunt in

[26] Cf. Prothero, *Select Statutes*, 4th ed., Oxford, 1918, xi-xlvii, 227-241, and Child, *op. cit.*, Oxford, 1918, 202, 249.

[27] F. Lyall Birch, "Art Court of High Commission," *Encyc. Brit.*, 14th ed., XI, 549. Cf. also Finlason, *op. cit.*, III, 417, 575, 589.

[28] *A History of Criminal Law*, London, 1883, III, 413.

praejudicium cujusquam senatus-consulti, sed tantum supplicem libellum, petitiones suas continentem, humiliter offerunt," [29] thus, remarks Child, declaring themselves subject, not only to the crown, but also to Parliament. But this was not the end of the matter. In the Parliament of 1566, a bill was introduced to give statutory sanction to the revised Articles, with a view, no doubt, to supply coercive machinery for their enforcement. But the queen would not have it; she required the bill to be withdrawn, and when the two archbishops complained " and went to speak to the Queen on the subject, she refused to see them for two days, and on the third, she treated them in such manner that they came out very crest-fallen." [30] Eventually, however, in 1571 the revised Articles did receive statutory sanction, and in the statute were described as:

> Articles, whereupon it was agreed by the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces and the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord, 1562, for the avoiding of the diversities of opinion and for the establishing of consent touching true religion, *put forth by the Queen's authority.*[31]

In a word, this basic declaration—" the true doctrine of the Church of England "—owing to the queen's intervention had to wait nine years for Parliamentary sanction, and when sanctioned was declared by Parliament itself as put forth by the queen's authority! The significance of these facts as showing the dominance over the Anglican Church in the first place of the queen and in the second, of Parliament, the dominance, that is, of the lay power, surely needs no further comment. It was the queen's authority that counted even in the declaration of its belief.

The bishops, too—" tools of the State " Child calls them—recognised this dominance. As Stapleton pointed out, it was from the queen that they received whatever jurisdiction they had. Such, indeed, is implied in the oath of allegiance and homage of Matthew Parker, the queen's first Archbishop of Canterbury. After the words of the oath of Supremacy, the formula continues:

[29] Strype, *Annals*, Oxford, 1820-1824, I, 1, 490.

[30] De Silva to Philip II, 23 December, 1566. *Spanish Calendar*, 606. Cf. Pollard, *op. cit.*, 263, 264.

[31] Eliz. c. 12.

"and further I acknowledge and confess to have and to hold the said archbishopric of Canterbury, and the possessions of the same entirely, as well the spiritualities as temporalities thereof, only of your Majesty and crown royal of this your realm." [32]

Nor is this surprising. For until far into the reign of Elizabeth episcopacy was not regarded as an essential element of the Anglican Church. At best it was but a human ordinance, an indifferent matter, dependent on the wishes of the sovereign. The doctrine of the divine institution of the office was only insisted upon in the last decade of the sixteenth century; a result, due in part at least to the increasing attacks of the Puritans on the episcopal office. Thus Matthew Parker, Elizabeth's first Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to Burghley in reference to the controversy provoked by Cartwright: "I refer the standing or falling altogether to your own considerations, whether her Majesty and you will have any archbishops or bishops, or how you will have them ordered." [33] Whitgift, too, the second in succession to Parker, showed the same mind, when consulted by the Privy Council on the subject. The Council had asked first, whether the name of bishop, as of any office having superiority over many churches or over pastors thereof, be known to Holy Scripture or no; and secondly whether superiority committed to a Minister of the Word

[32] Prothero, *Select Statutes*, 243. David Lewis points out that even in modern times "the same doctrine lives. King William IV, in his letters-patent appointing the first bishop of Australia, 'gives' to him and his successors, bishops of Australia, full power and authority to admit into holy orders of deacon and priest respectively any person whom he shall, etc., and in the patents of the other bishops it is said that 'they may perform all the functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of bishop' within their dioceses. When a bishop was sent to India, it was enacted in Parliament, 53 Geo. III, c. 155, s. 53, 'that such bishops shall not have or use any jurisdiction, or exercise any episcopal functions whatsoever,—but only such jurisdiction and functions as shall or may from time to time be limited to him by his majesty, by letters-patent under the great seal of the United Kingdom.'" Cf. Sander's *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, translated by David Lewis, London, 1877, 249, note. Cf. also T. Veech, *Dr. Nicholas Sanders and the English Reformation*, Louvain, 1936.

[33] *Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, Parker Society, 1853, 454. The letter is assigned by the editors to the year 1573. The "and you" of the above quotation is surely significant of Burghley's position.

and sacraments, over many churches and Pastors, be maintainable by the word of God, or no. Touching the first, Whitgift replied,

> mine opinion is, that the name of bishop, importing such superiority, is not to be found in the Scripture. For, by the whole course thereof, it appears, that the name of episcopus and presbyter imported one function. So as he that was a pastor, or elder, was also a bishop: and the bishop in like sort called elder. And therefore the name of episcopus being no name of distinction in office from the elder, could not import such superiority. . . .
>
> Of the second question, I think shortly thus; that the supreme civil magistrate, in every country, may appoint under officers, in the execution of the government, which he hath in ecclesiastical causes, as well as he may do in civil matters. For the reason is all one with them both.
>
> I do also think, that he is not restrained, but that he may appoint to that execution ministers of the word and sacraments, as he may do others; where of there be no precedent in the New Testament. For that in the times of the Apostles, no civil magistrate professed Christ's religion, but oppugned it. Yet, because I find no restraint hereof, I am led to this opinion.
>
> But as I think this charge may be in some manner committed to ministers of the word, so am I out of doubt, that the same so done is but an human ordinance, and may not be entitled to any greater authority, nor otherwise said to be God's ordinance, than all officers of civil magistrates be. And as they do therefore bear the name of human ordinances, because they are not set down in the word of God what they be, with all their bounds and limits; but are such as the policy of every country maketh them to be.

He then goes on to say that the bishops of England have only such authority as is given them by the statute 25 Henry VIII, which was revived by the first Parliament of Elizabeth. "Neither is it reasonable that they should make other claims. For if it had pleased her Majesty, with the wisdom of the realm, to have used no bishops at all, we could not have complained justly of any defect in our Church. Or if it had liked them to have limited the authority of bishops to shorter terms, they might not have said, they had any wrong." [84]

Bishops, in a word, were equated to civil officers. They held

[84] Strype, *Life of Whitgift*, III, 220-222. In 1588, Dr. Hammond, the chancellor of the diocese of London, wrote to Burghley in the same sense, repeating almost verbatim the words of Whitgift. Cf. *Hatfield Calendar*, III, 367-370.

"such authority as they possessed," writes J. W. Allen, "by virtue of a royal commission, and for no other reason, exactly as do justices of the peace." [35] The Church had, in fact, become a department of state. It may be added, that when the divine institution of episcopacy came to be maintained by Anglican divines and apostolic succession insisted upon, it was at once challenged as derogatory of her Majesty's supremacy over the Church! [36]

And as Elizabeth granted the bishops all the authority and jurisdiction they possessed, so she could deprive them of it. Indeed, in the Parliament of 1584-1585, she roundly threatened to depose them, as it were *en bloc,* unless they set about correcting the abuses in the Established Church; "all which, if you, my Lords of the clergy do not mend, I mean to depose you." [37] Grindal, it is true, when Archbishop of Canterbury, found the yoke somewhat heavy and endeavored to claim some independence for the Church, but he was promptly called to book by his suspension and by the queen's further threat of actual deprivation.

In the face of these facts—and they could easily be multiplied—it is surely useless to argue that the power claimed by the crown by the Act of Supremacy, was merely a temporal power over

[35] Cf. J. W. Allen, *op. cit.*, 172, 177-183. With the prevalence of such views on episcopacy it is not surprising that episcopal ordination of priests was not considered essential. G. W. Child has shown that though Anglican ministers were usually ordained by their bishops, such episcopal ordination was not held to be essential either in theory or in practice for half a century and more after the establishment of the Anglican Church under Elizabeth. Cf. *op. cit.*, 293-304. Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. VII, c. XLV, 11, and the letter of John Cosin, later Bishop of Durham, to Cordel, 7 February, 1650, may be cited in testimony of the same. (Both passages are printed in *Anglicanism*, edited by P. E. More and F. I. Cross, London, 1935, 397-402.) Cf. also F. G. Lee, *The Church under Queen Elizabeth*, London, 1880, I, 121, 122, and G. S. Carter, *The Anglican Via Media*, London, 1927, 83-105.

[36] Cf. The letters of Sir Francis Knollys to Burghley on the subject: Strype, *Life of Whitgift*, II, 34 and 50 ff., *Annals*, IV, 6. From the above it may be gathered how far from correct is Professor Pollard's statement concerning the first years of Elizabeth. "Spiritual powers were not derived from congregations or mixed assemblies of presbyters and elders, but from *apostolical succession.*" (*Political Hist.*, VI, 210).

[37] D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, 328.

ecclesiastical persons and property.[38] The fact is, that the royal power over the Anglican Church was in Elizabeth's reign exalted to a degree difficult in these days to realise. As Stapleton implied, the queen became both in theory and in practice Pope in England.

There is, indeed, substantial truth in the somewhat pungent words of Thomas Fitzherbert, another Catholic exile, which were published some ten years after the appearance of Stapleton's *Apologia.* "The God," he writes, "you believe in is the prince, your scriptures are the acts of Parliament, your religion is to conserve the state *per fas et nefas,* and therefore as all good Christians do measure the reason of state by religion, which is the true rule, and the end thereof, and from the which it cannot in reason dissent or disagree, so you on the other side reduce and frame religion to your false reason of state, and by that means pervert all the order both of nature and grace, preferring the body before the soul, temporal things before spiritual, human before divine, earth before heaven, the world before God, and which is more you subject both earth, heaven, body, soul, the world, yea God and all, to the private pleasure, and profit of your prince, as though he were the end, the Lord and God of all the world, and of nature itself." [39]

Equally clearly did the Catholic exiles realize that this conception of a National Church with supreme power vested in the crown, was fundamentally opposed to the old conception which had prevailed both in theory and practice up to the reign of Henry VIII, of one Universal Church, transcending all nations yet embracing all, with the pope as its supreme head. Some modern English historians, following in the wake of the great historian, F. W. Maitland,[40] now acknowledge that the Catholics exiles were right, and recognize this fundamental opposition between the medieval ecclesiastical system and doctrine and that introduced and established by Elizabeth.[41]

[38] F. Makower, *The Constitutional History and Constitution of the Church in England,* English trans., London, 1895, 257 ff.

[39] T. Fitzherbert, *An Apology,* 1602, 43 (Spelling modernised). Cf. J. W. Allen, *op. cit.,* 179.

[40] *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England,* London, 1898.

[41] See, for instance, G. W. Child, *op. cit.,* F. W. Davis, "England and Rome

It has been the fashion with some authors to minimise the changes effected by the queen. Vague phrases such as the Via Media and comfortable theories of continuity, as Professor Holdsworth has pointed out,[42] only obscure how radical those changes were. The writings of the Catholic exiles supply an excellent corrective.

LEO HICKS.

in the Middle Ages," and "Canon Law in England," two articles reprinted in his memoir by J. R. Weaver, W. S. Holdsworth, *A History of English Law*, 4th ed., London, I, 582-597, and IV, 47. Finlason refuted the claim to continuity put forth by the Elizabethan lawyer Coke in his *Reports*. Cf. Finlason's edition of Reeve's *History of English Law* where he has two excellent essays on the supremacy, III, 201 ff. and 568 ff. The Elizabethan Jesuit, Robert Persons, had also refuted Coke on the appearance of his *Reports*. Cf. Person's *An Answer to the Fifth Part of the Reportes lately put forth by Syr Edward Cooke*, 1606.

[42] "Both the legal and the doctrinal theory (of continuity) obscure the very fundamental change which had taken place at the Reformation." *Op. cit.*, I, 597. Cf. also Child, *op. cit.*, 273.

ECCLESIASTICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY CRUSADERS' STATE OF TRIPOLIS*

This paper aims to show in some detail ecclesiastical activities during the twelfth century in one of the states founded in the Levant by the Crusaders. Too often generalizations have been made concerning the cultural history of the Latin Orient which either treat the two centuries of its existence as a period without change, or consider the four Crusaders' states—Edessa, Antioch, Tripolis and Jerusalem—as identical. It is assumed that what was true for the thirteenth century was also true for the twelfth, or that conditions in the principality of Antioch reproduced those in the kingdom of Jerusalem. Since recent studies have demonstrated the political and administrative independence of the four (and after the loss of Edessa in 1144, the three) Crusaders' states, it has seemed worthwhile to examine more closely ecclesiastical conditions in one of them.[1] Definite limits have been placed as to subject matter, time and place. The twelfth century has been chosen, because after 1187, the county of Tripolis, which up to that time had been governed by the successors of Raymond of Toulouse, one of the leaders of the First Crusade, was merged with the principality of Antioch. Political, social, economic and military factors, though obviously important, have been entirely omitted except where they affect the religious.

I

The Land and Its Inhabitants

The county of Tripolis occupied some seventy-five miles of coast land on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean between

* Paper read at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, December 27, 1935, Boston, Mass.

[1] J. L. La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1100-1291* (Cambridge, 1932). Hans Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Berlin, 1883), and E. G. Rey, *Les Colonies Franques de Syrie aux XII^e et XIII^e Siècles* (Paris, 1883), are useful, but both treat the four Latin states

the principality of Antioch to the north and the kingdom of Jerusalem to the south. Its eastern limits, never clearly defined, were with one or two exceptions the mountain ranges which paralleled the coast at a distance of some twenty or thirty miles. In fact, except for the littoral plains, often extremely narrow, the county was largely mountainous. The northern end of the Lebanon range, about ten thousand feet at its highest point, not only formed the eastern boundary, but practically covered the entire southern half of the county, sometimes leaving hardly room for a road to pass along the shore. At the northern end of the range, a few miles north of capital city, Tripolis, was the depression or pass where the Nahr-al-Kebir took its source near Krak and where travelers and caravans could make their way to and from the prosperous coastal cities of the county, Tripolis, Tortosa, Gibelet, and others, and the Muslim Hims and Hama on the Orontes, or even Baalbek and Damascus. North of this pass, the Nusairi (known to day as the Alaouite) range stretches northward into the principality of Antioch. It is in reality a continuation of the Lebanon, but is somewhat lower and descends more gradually through plateaus to the sea.[2]

Despite the mountainous character of the greater part of the county, the soil was amazingly fertile, not only in the littoral plains watered by plentiful streams flowing down from the mountains, but even on the mountain slopes. Of this there is ample evidence from the vivid and often detailed accounts of contemporary pilgrims and travelers both Christian and Muslim.[3] A few quotations must suffice here as examples.

Passing through the littoral plain near the city, Tripolis, a

and the period of two centuries as a whole. Moreover, more recent editions of documents have necessitated a reëxamination of their work.

[2] For the historical geography of Syria, René Dussaud, *Topographie Historique de la Syrie Antique et Médiévale* (Paris, 1927), is excellent. See also P. Jaquot, *L'État des Alaouites* (Beyrouth, 1929).

[3] A number of Christian Pilgrims' Texts can be found in English translation in the volumes published by the *Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society* (cited *infra* as PPTS), 13 vols. (London, 1894-97). Others published separately are listed in R. Röhricht, *Bibliotheca Geographica Palaestina* (Berlin, 1890). Selections from Muslim geographers and travellers can be found in Guy Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems* (Boston and New York, 1890).

half century before the First Crusade, the Persian, Nasir-i-Khusrau, found "the whole neighborhood of the town occupied by fields and gardens and trees. The sugar-cane grows here luxuriantly, as likewise orange and citron trees, also the banana, the lemon, and the date." [4] Those familiar with the chronicles of the First Crusade will recall the pleasure of those warriors upon tasting "reeds of honey" for the first time.[5]

The cedars of Lebanon are famous. Evidently in the twelfth century, the mountain slopes were still largely covered, as we learn from the report of Johannes Phocas, a Greek who journeyed through Syria in 1185:

> . . . Mount Libanus, which is very beautiful and renowned in the Scriptures, a very great mountain clad in a robe of snow, hanging from it even as ringlets, overgrown with pine, cedar, and cypress-trees, and adorned with numerous other fruit-bearing trees of various kinds. The side thereof next the sea is inhabited by Christians, while the Saracens dwell on the side that looks towards Damascus and Arabia. From its ravines and hollows many rivers gush forth into the sea, beauteous and excessively cold at the time when the snow is melting and chills the streams which feed them. At the foot of this mountain is Tripolis, . . .[6]

Nor were there lacking "all kinds of fruits and vegetables, and everywhere springs of fresh water." [7] Vineyards also thrived; and the thirteenth-century pilgrim-monk, Burchard of Mt. Sion, tells us that the Lebanon "abounds in excellent vines, as it is written, 'the scent thereof shall be as the wine of Lebanon.'" [8]

One of the most famous of the mountain streams was the Nahr Kadisha (Nahr Abu Ali) which flowed from its source in the high peaks southeast of Tripolis down to the bay or gulf north of the city. It was considered sacred by both Muslims and Christians, and on the fertile lands along its course were many religious communities. A thirteenth century Latin tradition, which may

[4] Le Strange, *op. cit.*, pp. 348-49.

[5] Bartolf of Nangis (*Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Hist. Occ.*, III), p. 507; Albert of Aix (*Idem*, IV), pp. 456-57. See also C. Ritter, *Die Erdkunde im Verhältniss zur Natur und zur Geschichte des Menschen oder allgemeine vergleichende Geographie* (Berlin, 1854), XVII, 602.

[6] Johannes Phocas (PPTS, V), p. 9.

[7] Ibn al Fakih (Le Strange), p. 78.

[8] Burchard of Mt. Sion, *A Description of the Holy Land* (PPTS, XII), p. 14.

well have existed before, regarded the Nahr Kadisha as "the fountain of living waters whereof Solomon makes mention in the canticles." [9]

This region, at once mountainous, fertile and important commercially, had witnessed the rise and fall of successive civilizations, Phoenician, Graeco-Roman, Byzantine, Arabic and Turkish. Thus its population was uniform neither in composition nor in language. Probably the great majority of inhabitants were familiar with the Arabic tongue, but one contemporary traveler remarked, "that in the Lebanon district there are spoken seventy dialects, and no one people understands the language of the other except through an interpreter." [10] Though this is perhaps exaggerated, there is no doubt that the population was as cosmopolitan as that of New York.

Besides the many hermits and anchorites who inhabited the mountain regions, there were also several tribes or sects, both Christian and Muslim. Chief among the Muslim sects were the Assassins whose practice of political murder has given our word "assassin" (originally Hashashiyun, "consumers of Hashish") its sinister meaning.[11] In addition there were Nusairi,[12] Bedouins, Turcomars,[13] and doubtless many other tribes.

Some two hundred Jewish families had also settled in the towns, especially in Gibelet where were the remains of an old temple of the Ammonites, one of the tribes mentioned in the Old Testament.[14]

Of the original christian natives there were three general

[9] Jaques de Vitry, *History of Jerusalem* (PPTS, XI), p. 11; Burchard of Mt. Sion, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17; Rey, *Les Colonies*, pp. 358-59.

[10] Yakut (Le Strange), pp. 78-79.

[11] *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I, article "Assassins," II, article "'Isma'iliya"; H. Lammens, S. J., *Islam. Beliefs and Institutions* (tr. Sir E. Denison Ross, London, 1929), pp. 172 ff.

[12] Lammens, *op. cit.*, pp. 186 ff.; Rey, *op. cit.*, pp. 99 ff. Abulpharagius, *Chronicon Syriacum* (ed. and tr. P. J. Bruns and G. G. Kirsch, Leipzig, 1789), p. 288, mentions *Nazirae* in the Lebanon at the time of the First Crusade.

[13] Burchard of Mt. Sion, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 104-105.

[14] Benjamin of Tudela, *Viajes* (tr. I. G. Llubera, Madrid, 1918), p. 67; Wilbrand of Oldenburg, *Peregrinatio* (ed. J. C. M. Laurent in *Peregrinationes Medii Aevi Quatuor*, 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1873), p. 168.

groups, Syrians, Armenians and Greeks. The name Syrian was applied very generally and somewhat loosely by contemporary Latin chroniclers to various sects of native Christians, Maronites, Jacobites, Nestorians, etc., followers of the heresiarchs of the early centuries of Christianity. Some had united with the Greek church; some with the Roman, and it should be remembered that the schism of 1054 was still relatively recent; some were still separate from either. Some used a native Syrian liturgy, others a Greek. A few had become Muslims.

But apparently most of the native Syrian Christians inhabiting the Lebanon in Tripolis were Maronites. According to William of Tyre, the noted twelfth century historian of the Crusades, there were nearly forty thousand living in the hill country back of Gibelet, Botron and Tripolis.[15] They maintained monastic communities and several dioceses under a patriarch.[16] Some were also to be found in the cities. Followers for five hundred years of the teaching of an heresiarch named Maro, they abjured their heresy in 1182 and were reconciled to the Roman Catholic Church by the patriarch of Antioch. Though the general Latin opinion of the *Suriani* was disparaging, William of Tyre was favorably impressed by the Maronites. They were strong and able warriors, he said, and often helpful in important negotiations with the enemy. Hence their conversion and the sincerity of their faith were most welcome. They evidently had managed to preserve a certain amount of independence and autonomy throughout many centuries and many changes of government and continued to follow the Syriac liturgy.[17]

Little is known of the other groups of native Christians in the county of Tripolis, beyond the fact of their existence. Burchard of Mt. Sion found that the Lebanon mountains sheltered not only those Muslim and Christian sects already mentioned, but Armeni-

[15] William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum* (Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Historiens Occidentaux, I), p. 1076.

[16] Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus in IV patriarchatus digestus* (Paris, 1740), III, 45, 91-92. Burchard of Mt. Sion, p. 17.

[17] William of Tyre, pp. 1076-77; J. Labourt, "Maronites," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, X, 683 ff.; Rey, *Les Colonies*, p. 76.

ans, Greeks, Nestorians and Georgians. Similarly in the city of Tripolis, naturally a cosmopolitan center were "Greeks, Latins, Maronites, Nestorians, and many others." [18] The Jacobites, noted for their skill in medicine, maintained bishops at Archas, Tripolis and possibly Botron.[19]

These native Syrian Christians had contributed significantly to the advancement of learning. Many of them were tri-lingual, knowing Syriac, Arabic and Greek. Despite the oft-recurring crises of invasion, they had preserved the culture of classical antiquity and were able to teach their conquerors, the Arabs. Though Antioch and Edessa were the greatest centers of learning, both before and after the Arab conquest, Tripolis did not lag far behind. Unfortunately information for the twelfth century is scanty, but there is sufficient evidence from contemporary Muslim authorities to prove that at the time of the First Crusade, Tripolis was an intellectual center of sufficient importance to have what contemporary writers refer to as a "College" or "Academy of Learning" with a notable collection of books.[20]

There is no way of ascertaining to what extent the Latins of Tripolis associated themselves with or encouraged the native intellectual movement. The Muslim stories of Crusaders' pillaging may be exaggerated. Certainly they grew in the telling. For example, a century after the First Crusade, a Muslim chronicler describes with glowing detail, both the prodigious size of the library at Tripolis—three million books, including five hundred Korans and twenty thousand commentaries—and the deliberate burning of it by the fanatical Crusaders, one of whom, a priest,

[18] Burchard of Mt. Sion, pp. 16, 26.

[19] Le Quien, *op. cit.*, II, 1460, 1527. The earliest recorded Bishop of Tripolis is 1253. See also p. 1585 (9th century), "Ecclesia Hassassinitarum."(?) Rey, *op. cit.*, pp. 76 ff.

[20] Ibn al-Qalanisi (trans. H. A. R. Gibbs, *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades*, London, 1932), p. 89; Usamah ibn-Munqidh, *Memoirs* (trans. Philip K. Hitti, *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman in the Period of the Crusades*, New York, 1929), pp. 237-38. See also the later writers, Ibn al-Athir (Recueil, Hist. Or. I), p. 274; Ibn Khallikan, *Biographical Dictionary*, III, 455; En-Noweiri (Michaud, *Bibliothèque des Croisades*, IV [Reinaud]), p. 24. E. G. Rey, *Les Grandes Écoles Syriennes du IV^e^ au XII^e^ Siècle* (Paris, 1898), pp. 5-6; *Les Colonies*, Ch. VIII; Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte*, Ch. IV.

was persuaded that the library contained only Korans.[21] None the less it is but too true that among all the varoius motives imputed to Crusaders, desire for learning is conspicuous by its absence. The scholars of those days went to Sicily or Spain to learn from Muslim teachers. Moreover it is known that one or two famous Muslim scholars left Tripolis when the Crusaders captured the city.[22]

Yet even in the twelfth century some Latins took pains to familiarize themselves with the Arabic tongue, though it was more perhaps for diplomatic purposes than to enter the intellectual field. But some, such as William of Tyre, who is thought to have written a Mohammedan history from Arabic sources, must have come under the influence of Muslim and Syrian savants.[23] We do know that Count Raymond III of Tripolis, as most Latin princes, employed a native physician.[24] Although Latin churchmen, notably William of Tyre, deplored this practice, and attributed it to the influence of the women, there is no doubt that Western physicians had much to learn from their Syrian confrères. The latter were frequently Jacobite clerics.[25] Since Tripolis was known as an important intellectual center in the thirteenth century, it seems not unreasonable to believe that the native Syrians continued to carry on their scholarly activities during the twelfth century as before and after.[26]

[21] Ibn abi-Tai (trans. E. Quatremère, *Mémoires Geographiques et Historiques sur l'Égypte et sur Quelques Contrées Voisines* (Paris, 1811), II, 506-7.

[22] See Usamah (ed. Hitti), *loc. cit.*

[23] H. Prutz, "Studien über Wilhelm von Tyrus," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde*, VIII (1883), pp. 107-14; T. A. Archer and C. L. Kingsford, *The Crusades* (New York, 1894), pp. 247, 291.

[24] William of Tyre, *op. cit.*, p. 879; R. Röhricht, *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem* (1100-1291) (Innsbruck, 1898), p. 307.

[25] The eminent Jacobite philosopher, scientist and theologian, Abulpharagius, Gregorius Bar-Hebraeus, studied in Tripolis in the thirteenth century. (*Op. cit.*, pp. 66, 730; *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum* (ed. and tr. J. B. Abeloos and T. J. Lamy, Louvain and Paris, 1872-77), II, 668, 728-30; Rey, *Les Colonies*, pp. 82, 168-69, 179, 186.) See also al-Mukaddasi (Le Strange), p. 22 and J. S. Assemanus, *Bibliotheca Orientalis, Clementino-Vaticana* (Rome, 1719-28), II, ch. XLII.

[26] el-Makin (Michaud, *Bibliothèque*, IV [Reinaud]), p. 24. See also C. H. Haskins, *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, 1924), pp. 137 ff

II

The Religious Organization of the Crusaders

1) *Secular Clergy.* There were two patriarchates in the Latin Orient, Jerusalem and Antioch. The chief sees of the county of Tripolis, Gibelet, Tortosa and Tripolis, were included in the archdiocese of Tyre and subject to the Patriarch of Jerusalem.[27] Four or five lesser dioceses are occasionally mentioned in documents.[28] Unfortunately there are no records of any important relations between the clergy of Tripolis and the counts or their vassals. The same absence of evidence makes impossible any account of official relations between the Catholic hierarchy and the schismatic or heretical clergy. It is known that the Greek patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem had been forced to leave during the Latin occupation. Perhaps some of their subordinates submitted to Roman jurisdiction. But the only definite record, for the twelfth century at least, is the conversion of the Maronites.

Tortosa was renowned during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries for its shrine of Our Lady. Contemporary tradition ascribed the origin of the shrine to St. Peter. The present remains of the cathedral church built in a style transitional between Romanesque and Gothic, date probably from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century and constitute one of the best examples of medieval religious architecture in Syria. By the middle of the twelfth century

[27] William of Tyre, *op. cit.*, pp. 623-26; Röhricht, *op. cit.*, pp. 207-8; C. Du F. Du Cange, *Les Familles d'Outremer* (ed. E. G. Rey, Paris, 1869) (*Documents Inédits*, II), pp. 711-12. It should be noticed, however, that the Maronites were received into the Catholic Church by the Patriarch of Antioch. (*Supra.*)

[28] Botron, last mentioned as a see in 1181, and Archas were annexed to Tripolis. (William of Tyre, p. 1076; Röhricht, *Regesta regni Hierosolymitani* (Innsbruck, 1893), doc. 107.) Aradus and Maracles were annexed to Tortosa. (William of Tyre, p. 626; Rey-Du Cange, *Les Familles d'Outremer*, p. 809.). Raphania was a see in the twelfth century, but was annexed to Tortosa in the thirteenth. (Röhricht, "Syria Sacra," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palaestina-Vereins*, X (1887), p. 29; *Regesta*, doc. 211; A. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum* (Berlin, 1874-75), docs. 18, 629, 18, 927.) Artuscensis (Orthosia), mentioned in the account of William of Tyre (p. 626), is not recorded during the period of the Crusades. For the names of the incumbents of these sees, see Röhricht, *Syria Sacra*, pp. 20 ff.

a substantial edifice, probably destroyed by Saladin in 1188, apparently already existed and was mentioned by the Arab geographer, Idrisi.[29] Certainly during the twelfth century and perhaps long before, there was a shrine in Tortosa which had become one of the most popular pilgrimages in the Holy Land. The origin of this pilgrimage is obscure, but according to a tradition which was very clear during the twelfth century, Tortosa possessed the oldest chapel in Christendom dedicated to Our Lady. Not only was it her oldest shrine, but it had been founded by the apostle St. Peter. William of Tyre, however, is careful to mention it as a current tradition, not as an established fact:

> . . . Tortosa, where the apostle Peter, passing through Phoenicia is said to have built a small basilica in honor of the Mother of God, which even to this day is frequented by the visits of many people; and where God through the intercession of the same ever Virgin is said to confer many favors upon the faithful who are in need.[30]

There is no doubt the popularity of the pilgrimage. Conrad, bishop of Halberstadt, was reported cured of a fever there in 1204. Hugh of Cyprus made the pilgrimage in 1218 and in 1254 Joinville was sent there by St. Louis.[31] In the thirteenth century the shrine was frequented even more than in the twelfth to judge from the many references. Early in the century both Jaques de Vitry and Wilbrand of Oldenburg testified not only to the Apostolic origin of the shrine, but also to the crowds which visited the place and the miracles performed there. Both explain how even the Saracens were among the worshipers and recipients of divine favors.[32]

[29] Idrisi (Le Strange), p. 399, presumably incorrectly, locates the church on the neighboring island of Aradus. See M. van Berchem et E. Fatio, *Voyage en Syrie* (Cairo, 1914-15), I, 331-34; R. Dussaud, P. Deschamps, H. Seyrig, *La Syrie Antique et Médiévale Illustrée* (Paris, 1931), planches 117-18; Jaquot, *L'État des Alaouites*, pp. 86 ff.

[30] William of Tyre, p. 1065; van Berchem, *op. cit.*, pp. 329 ff. See also Anonymous Pilgrim V (PPTS, VI), p. 27, "Tortosa where the Apostles built a chapel in honour of the Blessed Virgin." This account was not written before 1198, although the pilgrimage was made before 1187 (Ed.).

[31] *Gesta episcoporum Halberstadensium* (MGSS, XXIII), p. 119; *Gestes des Chiprois* (ed. G. Raynaud, Geneva, 1887), p. 27; Rey, *Les Colonies*, p. 287; PPTS, XII (Burchard of Mt. Sion, ed. A. Stewart), p. 20, note 2.

[32] Jaques de Vitry (PPTS, XI), pp. 20-21; Wilbrand of Oldenburg, pp. 169-

Later centuries added to the tradition. It was definitely believed to be the oldest chapel to Our Lady, destroyed in 387 by an earthquake which, however, had left intact an altar with an icon of the Virgin painted on wood and attributed to St. Luke. It is significant that no twelfth or early thirteenth century source describes any such icon. It was first mentioned by a Greek in 1291 when the Christians fleeing to Cyprus took it with them.[33]

So far as can be determined, however, there is no definite historical basis even for the dedication of a shrine by the apostle, although St. Peter appears to have visited Tortosa. Pilgrims often incorrectly identified places connected with early Christian history. There were probably earlier shrines; but that need not concern us here.[34] The tradition was well established in the twelfth century.

2. *Regular Clergy.* There were several monastic foundations in the county, Catholic, schismatic and heretical. We know of their existence, but little more.[35] The most important Orders

70. See also *The City of Jerusalem* (tr. C. R. Conder, PPTS, VI), p. 48; Burchard of Mt. Sion (PPTS, XII), p. 20; Le Strange, p. 395.

[33] van Berchem, *op. cit.*, I, 330; C. Enlart, *Les Monuments des Croisés dans le Royaume de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1925-28), II, 403 ff.; Rey, *op. cit.*, pp. 286-87.

[34] Burchard of Mt. Sion (ed. Laurent in *Peregrinationes Medii Aevi Quatuor*), p. 30, note 107; C. R. Conder (PPTS, VI), p. 48, note 2; A. Stewart (PPTS, XI), p. 20, note 5. According to *Acta S. Petri, S. Lino eius discipulo*, St. Peter stopped at Tortosa. According to *Acta Sanctorum*, Junii, VII, p. 388, St. Peter healed Clement's mother "ad insulam Antaradum nomine."

[35] Rey, *Les Colonies*, p. 359, lists eight Maronite and six Latin communities. Of the latter, the Cistercian abbey of Belmont, southwest of Tripolis, was founded in 1169. (Röhricht, *Syria Sacra*, p. 35. There were also priories of the Holy Sepulchre at Pilgrims' Mt. and at Tripolis in the twelfth century (Röhricht, *Regesta*, docs., 48, 191, 192, 217, 218, etc.) A priory of St. Michael was apparently established in Tripolis by 1184 (*Idem.*, docs., 637, 745, 983, 1444.) The monastery of St. Mary Magdalen is referred to in the thirteenth century (*Idem, Additamentum*, doc. 973, note 1.) I can find no reference to a priory of St. Savior in Tripolis, or of Carmes in Beaulieu(?), both mentioned by Rey. See also Enlart, *Les Monuments des Croisés*, II, 325 ff., where is described a chapel of St. Savior, located just north of Botron at Quoba, and Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, III, 1-100. There were also monasteries of St. James in Tripolis and Gibelet in the thirteenth century. (Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 1214a, note 2; doc. 868, note 3.) Convents in the kingdom of Jerusalem often received donations of property in the county. (See Röhricht, *Regesta*,

established in Tripolis, as in the other Latin states, were the two famous religio-military Orders, the Templars and the Hospitallers. The military character of these Orders is well known, but it is sometimes forgotten that both were originally founded for a charitable purpose and both remained integral parts of the ecclesiastical establishment. The Knights of the Temple, or Templars, had from the beginning been an Order of knights sworn to protect pilgrims and to defend the Holy Land. Their rule of life, formally sanctioned by the Council of Troyes in 1128, and inspired, if not drawn up by St. Bernard, included the customary monastic vows, though not necessarily for life. The Knights of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, or Hospitallers, were originally established as an Order devoted to the care of the sick and to kindred charitable works including the maintenance of a hospice for pilgrims at Jerusalem. But, as the Templars, they become known as a rich and prosperous association of knights. This was not so much degeneration from a higher ideal as adaptation to the exigencies of the military situation. The necessity for fortifying and garrisoning the frontiers demanded just such institutions as these, composed of men without feudal or family ties, devoting their lives to that all important purpose. It is not known precisely when the Hospitallers were transformed into a military Order, but this seems to have been accomplished largely during the regime of Raymond du Puy as grand master (1120-60). At any rate by 1136 the castle, Bait Jibrin, in the kingdom of Jerusalem had been committed to their care. But the Hospitallers never forsook their original purpose. Military activities were added to, but did not displace the maintenance of hospitals.[36]

docs., 191, 331-2, etc., 605; "Studien zur Mittelalterlichen Geographie und Topographie Syriens," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palaestina Vereins*, X (1187), pp. 239 ff.).

[36] E. J. King, *The Hospitallers in the Holy Land* (London, 1931), pp. 31-32, ch. III; J. Delaville Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers en Terre Sainte et à Chypre* (1100-1300) (Paris, 1904), ch. III; T. A. Archer and C. L. Kingsford, *The Crusades* (New York, 1894), ch. XI; D. C. Munro, *The Kingdom of the Crusaders* (New York, 1935), pp. 98-100; W. B. Stevenson, *The Crusaders in the East* (Cambridge, 1907), pp. 136-37; H. Prutz, *Die Geistlichen Ritterorden* (Berlin, 1908), p. 50.

The history of both orders in Tripolis illustrates this development and expansion, and has the added ecclesiastical interest of showing the relations between these Orders and the Papacy, the local government, and the local secular clergy.

A) *The Hospitallers.* Fortunately there is considerable documentary and other evidence concerning the activities of the Hospitallers in the Holy Land.[37] That which deals with the Order in Tripolis illustrates primarily four things: first, the establishment of the Order in Tripolis during the first half of the twelfth century as a non-military charitable institution; second, the exemptions and immunities conferred upon the Order; third, the transformation of the Order into a military organization which maintained some of the county's most formidable castles; fourth, its economic activities. It would be impossible here to discuss in detail all this material. I have endeavored to choose enough to illustrate these significant developments and to summarize the rest.

The property acquired by the Hospitallers in Tripolis before 1142 was entirely non-military. With one or two exceptions it consisted of donations such as any religious foundation might receive for its maintenance.[38] The exceptions indicate the particular character of the Order. Included in the earliest bequests made by Raymond of Toulouse, the founder of the county, and his son, Bertram, were villas and houses in the territory of Raphania, the easternmost town of the county, beyond the Nusairi mountains. The grant specified that a hospice for the poor was to

[37] See especially the collection of documents made by J. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire Général des Hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem (1100-1300)* (Paris, 1894-1906). Summaries of and references to the documents contained in this work can be found in R. Röhricht, *Regesta regni Hierosolymitani* (Innsbruck, 1893) (*Additamentum*, Innsbruck, 1904), and in Le Roulx, "Inventaire de Pièces de l'Ordre de L'Hôpital," *Revue de l'Orient Latin*, XI (1908), pp. 181-91. Except where otherwise indicated, the dating followed here is that of Le Roulx or Röhricht, *Additamentum* where numbers are repeated from the *Regesta* and new numbers added.

[38] Röhricht, *Regesta*, docs. 78, 88, 108, 118 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, docs. 43, 48, 63, 79, 82).

be built.[39] In 1126 Count Pons turned over to the Order a hospital for the poor (*hospitale pauperum*) at Pilgrims' Mount, the fortress-suburb of the city of Tripolis.[40]

To these significant bequests were added exemptions and immunities from both church and government. The earliest of these was the bull issued by Pope Pascal II in 1113, by which he formally took the Order under his protection. Among other concessions, it authorized the brothers of the Order to keep all tithes levied in their domains despite any contradiction by the bishops and their clergy. Thus they were exempt from the customary payment of tithes to the church in the localities where they held property.[41] In 1135 and 1137 Innocent II added to the ecclesiastical privileges of the Order. Bishops were forbidden to place the churches of the Hospitallers under interdict; and in case of a general interdict, members of the Order were to be allowed to celebrate Divine Office for themselves, to have church burial wherever they were, and the right to open churches anywhere to the public once a year.[42] Meanwhile from Count Pons and Bishop Bernard of Tripolis, they had received exemption from payment of toll at the port and market place of Tripolis.[43] Thus in the early decades of the twelfth century, the Hospitallers, though still devoted entirely to their original charitable purpose, had become increasingly wealthy and privileged and virtually independent of the local secular clergy.

The year 1142 marks the appearance of the Hospitallers in the county of Tripolis as a definitely military Order. A significant donation of Count Raymond II included the entire town of Ra-

[39] The documents recording these donations do not exist, but the fact that they were made is proved by later documents confirming them. Cf. Röhricht, *Regesta*, docs. 108, 118 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, docs. 79, 82). In 1119, Pope Calixtus II referred to the Order as guardian of pilgrims and the poor. (Le Roulx, *Cartlutaire*, doc. 48.)

[40] Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 108 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 79).

[41] Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 71 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 30); King, *The Knights Hospitallers*, pp. 23, 26-28. H. Prutz, *Die Geistlichen Ritterorden*, p. 144, note 6, I think, wrongly disagrees with Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers*, pp. 42, 55, 33 (?), in maintaining that a general exemption came later.

[42] King, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-53; Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, docs. 113, 122.

[43] Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 108 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 79).

phania and the neighboring fortress of Barin (*Mons Ferrandus*) in *mortmain*, that is, complete sovereignty with no retention of feudal rights.[44] Since Barin was probably not in Christian hands at that time,[45] the inclusion in the same deed of the fief of Crat, with the permission of its former lord, William, was more significant. Later known as Krak it included the famous "castle of the Kurds" (Hisn al-Akrad) which was transformed by the Hospitallers in the course of the next seventy-five years into the famous fortress of *Le Krak des Chevaliers*, perhaps the greatest example of exclusively military architecture produced anywhere during the Middle Ages.[46] It does not seem to have been referred to in 1142 as a castle, although something must have remained of the old Muslim stronghold. As in the case of Raphania, its

[44] Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 212 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 144): "cum omnibus suis pertinentiis et cum omni jure facti, tam meis propriis quam ex omnibus feodalibus, absque ulla federis obligatione et absque ullo retentu, omni remota prorsus calupnia (*sic.*) quiete libere in elemosinam et dominationem et ligietatem omnium hominum, tam militum quam burgensium, ibi terras habentium et possessiones. . . ."

La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, p. 222, describes the passage of lands to the Orders as *mortmain*. Although the actual form of tenure seems to have been *frankalmoin*, these lands, after their transfer, could be regarded as in *mortmain* and removed from the feudal hierarchy. (E. Chénon, *Histoire Générale du Droit Français Public et Privée des Origines à 1815* (Paris, 1926), I, section 295, p. 786; Sir Frederick L. Pollock and F. W. Maitland, *The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1923), I, 240 ff.)

[45] Since Barin had been captured by Zengi in 1127 (Stevenson, *The Crusaders*, pp. 137-38, 147, note 3), it is difficult to understand what was intended by its inclusion in this grant, unless some revenues in the district were still collected by the Latins. On the other hand, the terms of the grant are so definite and not conditional upon its possible capture sometime in the future, that it almost appears as though there had been a short period not recorded by chronicler, when it was again in Latin hands. This might have been between 1142, the date of the issue of this grant, and 1145, the date of its confirmation. (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 160; Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 236; van Berchem, *Voyage en Syrie*, I, 160, note 3.) The next reference to Barin is in 1175, when it was captured by Saladin from one of Nur al-Din's emirs. (Stevenson, *op. cit.*, p. 211.)

[46] Detailed studies of this castle have been made by several archaeologists. See the works of Deschamps, Enlart, van Berchem, Rey, etc., and the list cited by Jaquot, *L'État des Alaouites*, p. 253, and Bibliography.

transfer to the Order reserved no jurisdiction to the count or the former lord.[47]

But perhaps the most striking evidence of the military rôle the Hospitallers were expected to play is the agreement set forth in this same document that in all military operations in which the count was present, the Order should share with him one-half of the spoils. The rest they could keep. In case he were not present, they need not share with the constable or marshal or anyone else, except what fell to individuals in the lot of battle. The same provisions should hold with that person who should be in charge of the county and of his son, in the event of his own death before the majority of his son. Upon reaching his majority, his son was to be similarly bound. In addition the count pledged himself not to make any treaty with the Saracens without the consent of the Hospitallers.

It is natural to suppose that Raymond II was prompted to further the growth of the Hospitallers in Tripolis as a military unit by the pressing need for adequate defense of the borders against Zengi, atabek of Mosul, whose activities along the frontiers of the northern states was an increasing menace at that time, as the capture of Barin in 1137 testified.[48]

In addition to these military provisions, the grant of 1142 also contained the significant privilege of free trade in the entire county to the Hospitallers and the Syrians of Krak.

This document has been discussed in detail since it legally recognized the change which had taken place in the position of the Hospitallers in Tripolis. They had not only assumed a prominent military rôle, which indicated a departure from their original purpose, but had as a result acquired a unique position in the county, of political, religious and economic independence. The possession of Raphania and Krak, two important fiefs in *mortmain,* without feudal obligations, assured them, at least as far as those places were concerned, political independence. Their

[47] Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 144.

[48] King, *The Knights Hospitallers*, p. 36; Stevenson, *The Crusaders*, pp. 137-47; Prutz, *Die Geistlichen Ritterorden*, p. 52.

special protection by the Pope, the freedom from interdict, the exemption from the payment of tithes to the local clergy, guaranteed them an ecclesiastical autonomy. In the economic field, they were to enjoy freedom of trade in the county and were exempt from the payment of tolls at the port and market place of Tripolis. These dispensations, together with the possession of castles occupying strategic positions on the frontier, the right to be consulted before any treaty was made with the Saracens, and a large share in any booty, set them apart from both clergy and laity of the county.

After 1142 the Hospitallers continued to receive property of military significance. In 1170 King Amalric, then acting as regent of Tripolis during Count Raymond III's captivity, handed over to them the two castles of Archas and Gibelakar (Hisn Akkar), both of which had been damaged by the earthquake in June of the same year. They were to be restored and kept in perpetuity without any reservation of feudal jurisdiction. In addition the king conceded to them a privilege of spoil similar to that granted by Raymond II, and provided for the continuation of the grant with its privileges by Raymond III, if after his release he were so disposed.[49]

Upon regaining his liberty, Raymond III probably (though not certainly) confirmed this grant. Certainly he did confirm in general terms all arrangements made by his father and his predecessors and in addition renounced the portion of the "standard," as it was called, or that portion of the spoils of battle which his father had reserved to himself.[50]

[49] Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 477 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 411).

[50] Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 519 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 467). The term "predecessors" is a common designation in confirmations and may or may not include Amalric. Moreover, in renouncing his share of the spoils of war, Raymond expressly refers to the privileges extended by his father and not those granted by King Amalric. (Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers*, p. 75, note 2, I think incorrectly says the reservation made by Amalric.) Therefore the document itself does not specifically confirm the grant made by Amalric. It does, however, seem probable that since the Hospitallers aided the count in his release, he would not at the same time have insistd on the return of the two castles.

Further references cast but little light on the subject. In recounting a raid

Therefore the Hospitallers gained at least temporary, and probably permanent rights of ownership over two more strongholds, Gibelakar and Archas, and an extension of their special military privileges. Gibelakar was situated on the northern slopes of the Lebanon mountains and with Krak opposite commanded the Nahr al-Kebir pass.[51] Archas, between Gibelakar and the city of Tripolis, commanding the approaches to the city, was a flourishing town at the time of its capture by the Crusaders. But the subsequent viscissitudes of capture and recapture and the earthquakes of 1157 and 1170 must have robbed it of its former prosperity.[52] Its possession, whatever its condition, increased the prestige of the Order and added to the political responsibility of the knights as administrators.

In 1177 the acquisition of Chastel Rouge, another great stronghold situated between Tortosa and Chastel Blanc in the northern part of the county, with no reservation of tenure by the count and the former owners, gave the Hospitallers control of four of the major fortresses of the county, Krak, Archas, Gibelakar and Chastel Rouge, as well as one or two smaller castles.[53] They now had a commanding influence in the military affairs of the county.

by Saladin in Tripolis in 1180, William of Tyre, *op. cit.*, p. 1064, mentions Archas, but does not indicate its owner. In 1210 there is a reference to Astafortis as former lord of Gibelakar. (*L'Estoire de Eracles Empereur* (*Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Hist. Occ.* II), p. 314; Rey, *Sommaire du Supplément aux Familles d'Outre-Mer* (Chartres, 1881), p. 10.) The same name appears on documents between 1177 and 1187, but without reference to Gibelakar. (Röhricht, *Regesta, passim.*) It may have been with his consent that Gibelakar was donated to the Hospitallers although his name does not appear in any record of the transaction.

According to Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers*, p. 75, note 2, and La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy*, p. 197, note 1, confirmed Raymond III the grant originally made by King Amalric, but in view of the wording of the document, there is at least some doubt.

[51] Stevenson, *The Crusaders*, p. 198, note 2, p. 200, notes 3-5.

[52] *Idem*, pp. 142, 200, notes 3-5; William of Tyre, *op. cit.*, p. 1064.

[53] Röhricht, *Regesta*, docs. 549, 562a (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, docs. 519, 549). In 1163, the Order received the small castle of Sark near Chastel Blanc, and in 1180, the small castle of Tuban near Raphania. (Röhricht, *Regesta*, docs. 378, 594b [Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 317].) For other grants of property made to the Order by Count Raymond III and his vassals see *idem, passim.*

Moreover, when in 1174 Count Raymond was in need of financial assistance to pay his ransom, he turned to the Hospitallers as bankers. At least this seems a plausible interpretation of a document in which he expresses his gratitude to the grandmaster, Jobert, brother Arnold Lombard and the other members of the Order for their efforts in his behalf.[54] In fact when Raymond III died, he was still in their debt to the extent of 37,000 besants.[55]

But it must not be supposed that either the privileges conferred upon the Order or its increasing military character occasioned no unfavorable comment. In 1180 (1178) Pope Alexander III wrote briefly but emphatically to the grandmaster, Roger of Moulins, urging him not to neglect the charitable work of caring for the poor and sick for the pursuit of arms. He admonished the grandmaster that his knights should take up arms only when the standard of the Holy Cross was raised in defense of the kingdom or to besiege a place occupied by the infidels.[56] There is no record that the papal warning obtained the desired result, but it was not repeated during this period.[57] It is the first instance of a warning to the Order from the Holy See, and is evidence that Rome had no intention of sanctioning the neglect of the Order's original charitable ideal, no matter how important frontier defense might be.

Moreover the exemptions and immunities called forth protests from the local clergy, naturally jealous of their own rights and revenues. As early as 1126-27 the church at Tripolis maintained that the Order legally owed tithes from its property. Only after

These included even the Muslim city of Hims, claimed, but never actually possessed by the Crusaders. (Röhricht, *Regesta*, docs. 637, 651a, 651b [Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, docs. 676, 801, 804].) In addition, some of their establishments had increased in importance. The church and hospital at Pilgrims' Mt. had by 1175 become a commandery. The house given them in Tripolis in 1126 had become a commandery by 1192. (Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers*, p. 433.)

[54] Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 519 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 467).

[55] *Idem*, docs. 742-43 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, docs. 1031-32).

[56] Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 527; *Les Hospitaliers*, pp. 86-87; Prutz, *Die Geistlichen Ritterorden*, p. 153.

[57] The Chapter General of 1181 specifies the medical supplies to send from Pilgrims' Mt. to Jerusalem. (E. J. King, *The Rule, Statutes and Customs of the Hospitallers*, 1099-1310 (London, 1923), p. 37.)

litigation in an ecclesiastical court consisting of judges designated by the Holy See, was the claim withdrawn.[58] In 1155 the aged patriarch of Jerusalem, Fulk, and the Latin clergy of the Holy Land protested without avail to the papal *curia* against the increasingly privileged position of the Hospitallers.[59]

In 1179, however, complaints from the secular clergy to the Lateran council received more attention. In case of interdict, divine office could be celebrated only once a year in the churches of the Order, and no burials were permitted. *Confratres* or lay associates who did not intend to bequeath all their property, and submit completely to the life and rules of the Order, were not to be exempt from episcopal jurisdiction.[60] Although by this new bill certain abuses arising from the privileged position of the Order were removed, the fundamental immunities remained; and the secular clergy, not satisfied, continued their complaints. Finally in 1180-81 it was necessary for the Holy See to reiterate its warnings to respect the person and property of both the Hospitallers and the Templars.[61]

It will be noticed that in every one of these cases, the Holy See (or its delegates) was the final arbiter. In this connection also it is significant that in 1179 a dispute between the Hospitallers and Templars was settled and a method of consultation and arbitration outlined by Pope Alexander III, while the local princes, the

[58] Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 117 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 72). Le Roulx, I think incorrectly, dates this transaction December 1125, since this is the date of an agreement between Bishop Bernard and the Order which was merely inserted in this document because it had been referred to in the settlement of the dispute. Röhricht dates it tentatively 1126. The document mentions Philip, cantor of Tripolis as the negotiator. A document dated February 8, 1128, mentions Garsion as cantor of Tripolis. (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, doc. 82.) If he was Philip's successor, the document should be dated before February 8, 1128.

[59] King, *The Knights Hospitallers*, pp. 52-55. Apparently the privileges of the Order had been extended to its *confratres* or lay associates.

[60] Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers*, pp. 87-88; *Cartulaire*, doc. 560. About this time Count Raymond III became a *confrater* of the Order. (Röhricht, *Regesta*, docs. 602, 637 [Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, docs. 596, 676].) On *confratres* see Le Roulx, *op. cit.*, pp. 297-98; King, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

[61] Le Roulx, *op. cit.*, p. 88, notes 2-4; *Cartulaire*, docs. 590-612.

king of Jerusalem, the prince of Antioch and the count of Tripolis merely ratified the decision as witnesses.[62] Thus under the protection of the Papacy and with the patronage of the counts and their vassals, the Hospitallers had achieved a commanding position of political, military, religious and economic independence in the county of Tripolis.

B) *The Templars.* In contrast to the abundance of material to be found concerning the history of the Hospitallers in the Holy Land, there are few records of the activities of the Templars, especially from the twelfth century.[63] It is not known precisely when they first appeared in the county of Tripolis. Possibly they were at Tortosa as early as 1158 or 1169.[64] Certainly they were in the county before 1173. At that time William of Tyre speaks of the castles which the Templars maintained close to the territory of the Assassins, and of the tribute of two thousand gold pieces owed the Templars by these mountain dwellers.[65] The origin of this tribute is not explained, but it was presumably the result of successful campaigning on the part of the knights. Moreover, it seems likely that the castles William of Tyre mentions were Tortosa, Safita (Chastel Blanc) and the smaller Aryma, each of which was close to the territories of the Assassins. Safita and Aryma are known to have belonged to the Templars in the thir-

[62] Röhricht, *Regesta*, docs. 572-73 (Le Roulx, *Cartulaire*, docs. 558-59); King, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-109; Le Roulx, *op. cit.*, p. 87; Prutz, *Die Geistlichen Ritterorden*, pp. 60-61.

[63] Prutz, *op. cit.*, p. 200. The *Cartulaire Général de l'Ordre du Temple* (1119-1150) ed. Marquis d' Albon (Paris, 1913), contains no material pertinent to Tripolis.

[64] A letter written in 1158 by al-Malik al-Salih, vezir of Egypt, to Usamah, seems to refer to the Templars of Tortosa. (H. Derenbourg, *Ousama* (Paris, 1893), II, 293.) See also *Encyc. of Islam*, p. 680 (Tartūs). However, the Rainoard family were lords of Tortosa at least as late as 1151 and possibly as late as 1163. (Röhricht, *Regesta*, docs. 270, 378.) Rey, *Sommaire*, p. 11, says that the cession of the city to the Templars was after 1163.

In 1169 a series of controversies between the bishop of Valania (Banias), in Antioch, and the Templars was settled in Tortosa. (Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 462; van Berchem, *Voyage en Syrie*, I, 322.)

[65] William of Tyre, *op. cit.*, p. 997.

teenth century.[66] Tortosa became their chief stronghold, where, it was said, they kept their treasure.[67] A document dated 1183 records a preceptor of the Templars at Tortosa.[68] Perhaps the knights had aided the construction of Tortosa's castle, built along the shore and enclosed by walls which separated it from the city proper. By 1188 two towers had been completed, one of which was strong enough to withstand the attack of Saladin.[69] Moreover the dispute mentioned above, between the Templars and the Hospitallers, which was settled by the Pope in 1179, concerned, among other things, questions of property in Tripolis.

The paucity of documents and records of the Templars makes it difficult to determine to what extent the Order received special ecclesiastical privileges and immunities comparable to those of the Hospitallers. But such documents as exist, coupled with the incessant complaints of the secular clergy of the Holy Land, show that the Templars were similarly privileged with regard to such matters as revenues, exemption from the payment of tithes, interdict and their general independence of any prelate save the Pope.[70] The bull *Omne datum optimum,* issued in 1163 by Alexander III, a particular friend of the Templars, established the constitution of the Order and provided for its centralization at Jerusalem.[71] In 1179 the decrees of the Lateran council which have just been discussed in their relation to the Hospitallers, applied also to the Templars, defining and limiting their privileges.

[66] Jaquot, *L'État des Alaouites*, p. 106; Enlart, *Les Monuments des Croisés*, II, 89 ff.; Rey, *Les Colonies*, 134-37, 361; Dussaud, Deschamps, Seyrig, *La Syrie*, planches 148-49.

[67] Rey, *Étude sur les Monuments de l'Architecture Militaire des Croisés en Syrie et dans l'Ile de Chypre* (Paris, 1871), p. 80 (from Makrizi).

[68] Röhricht, *Regesta*, doc. 630.

[69] Stevenson, *The Crusaders*, p. 258, note 1; Beha ed-Din (PPTS, XIII), p. 127.

[70] Prutz, *Die Geistlichen Ritterorden*, pp. 200-207, 225, 227, ch. VI; *Entwicklung und Untergang des Tempelherrenordens* (Berlin, 1888), ch. III, IV; Le Roulx, "Bulles pour l'Ordre du Temple," *Revue de l'Orient Latin*, XI (1908), pp. 407-18.

[71] Prutz, *Die Geistlichen Ritterorden*, pp. 208, 218, 225; *Entwicklung und Untergang des Tempelherrenordens*, pp. 38 ff.; Le Roulx, *op. cit.*, p. 412, doc. VII.

Immunity from local governmental jurisdiction was also maintained. In 1173-74 the sheikh of the Assassins, who seriously contemplated embracing the Christian faith, sent an envoy to King Amalric of Jerusalem. The envoy was killed by Walter de Mesnil and some Templars of Tripolis.[72] Amalric realized that unless Walter were punished, royal authority would be seriously compromised. Odo of St. Amand, grand-master of the Templars, insisted on the right to punish a member of his own Order, promised to send him to the Pope and forbade anyone to do him violence. Nevertheless, Amalric arrested the culprit, declared him guilty of lèse-majesté and sent him to prison. Unfortunately, Amalric's untimely death prevented his going to the heart of the problem.

While this incident makes clear the Templar's claim to independence of royal jurisdiction, it is just possible that Amalric, perhaps the strongest of the kings of Jerusalem, had he lived longer, might have made good his insistence on the superiority of the crown even over a religio-military Order, and thereby established a precedent for all the Latin rulers. After his death, political conditions in the kingdom made any such assertion impossible and the Templars continued to enjoy immunity. It will be recalled that in 1180-81, it was necessary for the Holy See to reiterate its warnings to respect the persons and property of both Orders.

A modern historian has well described the position of both Templars and Hospitallers in the kingdom of Jerusalem. It was essentially the same in the county of Tripolis:

> . . . They were entirely independent of the kings and the feudal hierarchy, and, chartered by the Papacy and supported by the Roman See, they were no more than ecclesiastical allies who freely consented to assist the crown in its struggles with the enemies of Christ.[73]

Such were the varied religious activities in one Latin state of the Levant during the twelfth century, a curious mélange of Euro-

[72] William of Tyre, pp. 995-99; Röhricht, *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem*, pp. 357-58; La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy*, p. 223, note 4.

[73] La Monte, *op. cit.*, p. 222.

pean feudal custom and ecclesiastical practice, conditioned by the exigencies of military defense, superimposed on a complex native culture, itself the product of many previous civilizations. Though Tripolis may in many respects be regarded as typical, it must be emphasized once more that the three Latin states were virtually independent, and that their respective developments, while similar, were by no means identical. Each should be studied separately before generalization is made about all three.

MARSHALL W. BALDWIN.

THE ORGANIZER OF THE CHURCH IN NEW ENGLAND:

Bishop Benedict Joseph Fenwick (1782-1846).[1]

"The foundation of a Catholic Church in Boston," William Tudor wrote about 1818, was a marvel that "only could be surpassed by devoting a chamber in the Vatican to a Protestant chapel."[2] The first of these wonders came to pass in 1788. In 1808 there was founded a Diocese of Boston, embracing all New England. But in spite of the truly apostolic labors of the first Bishop, Cheverus, and the immense personal popularity achieved by him, the progress of the Church in the land of the Puritans remained in his time extremely slow. When he retired to France in 1823, he left a diocese that was wellnigh the feeblest and the poorest in America. New England still ranked with the South as one of those parts of the United States where Catholicism seemed to have the least chance of ever taking firm root. Today, little more than a century later, New England, with its eight dioceses, its three million Catholics, its 3,600 priests and over 1,500 churches, has become one of the most flourishing centres of Catholic activity, not only in this country, but in the world.

The great change began during the reign of the second Bishop of Boston, Benedict Joseph Fenwick. If Cheverus and Matignon may be called the founders of the Church in New England, Fenwick first placed it upon a solid foundation here, guided the beginnings of its amazing advance, and deserved to rank as its true organizer. He was also, probably, the ablest of the early Catholic prelates of New England, and certainly the one most sorely tried.

Bishop Fenwick's biography has not yet been written. The sources for it are all too copious. I have delved into them ex-

[1] Paper read at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, December 26, 1935, Boston, Mass.

[2] *Letters on the Eastern States* (New York, 1820), 69.

tensively, not only in the voluminous printed literature, but in the archives of Boston, Baltimore, New York, Notre Dame, and many other places. But the following sketch of the man and his work rests upon a confessedly incomplete study of the overwhelming mass of material.

The future Bishop of Boston was by birth something of an aristocrat. Sprung from an ancient and distinguished line of gentry in Northumberlandshire, England, the Fenwicks had always ranked among the leading Catholic families of Maryland: a family conspicuous, not so much for wealth, though they were tolerably well-to-do, as for their sterling loyalty to a persecuted faith and to old-fashioned standards of honor, integrity, and upright living.

Benedict Joseph Fenwick was born September 3, 1782, at his father's plantation on Beaver Dam Manor, near Leonardtown, St. Mary's County, Maryland. His father, George Fenwick, a planter and surveyor, who took a notable part in laying out the District of Columbia and the City of Washington, remains a somewhat dim figure. All the clearer is the strong and perhaps decisive influence upon the boy of his mother, Margaret Medley Fenwick. Even to extreme old age perennially youthful and active, genial, "jovial," "full of life and jests," the mother of five sons, three of whom became eminent priests, "our Monica," as the Jesuits called her,—for this mother the Bishop ever cherished the tenderest affection, and to her he confessed that he owed, under God, whatever he possessed of religion and piety.

About young Benedict's schoolboy years we know little except some dates and external facts. At Georgetown College (1793-1805) he must, in spite of the newness of the institution, have received a pretty solid training in the humanities and in philosophy; and he began the study of theology, which he continued for a year at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore (1805-06). At both places he evidently stood out as a leader, as able as he was popular. His thoughts having at some unknown period become centred on the priesthood, and at least since 1803 on becoming a Jesuit, he was one of the first six who entered the novitiate of the restored Society of Jesus at Georgetown on October 10, 1806. On

June 11, 1808 (the date has been variously given) he was ordained a priest by Bishop Neale.

The next period of his life, from 1808 to 1825, is better documented and tolerably well known. For the most part these were years of the most strenuous, successful, and highly creditable activity on some of the Church's most critical battle-fronts. In New York (Nov., 1808-April, 1817) he gained invaluable experience in building up a newly created and long bishopless diocese almost from the foundations: for a time he was, in fact if not in name, its administrator, and then vicar-general. He had a large share in erecting, on a grander scale than he was ever able to attempt in Boston, the first St. Patrick's Cathedral. He was president of a successful but short-lived college, the New York Literary Institute. By indefatigable and devoted pastoral activity, by his "continual and remarkable preaching," by missionary tours far and wide, and by his success with converts, he earned golden opinions on all sides from the beginning of his ministry. The Father of the American Hierarchy pronounced him a "young man above all praise."[3] Bishop Cheverus wrote: "Fr. Fenwick is the object of universal respect and love. . . . His praise is in the hearts of all who know him. He is, I sincerely believe, *dilectus Deo et hominibus.*"[4]

Recalled to Maryland, he served for a year as President of Georgetown College (1817-18); and Fr. Stonestreet could declare thirty years later that that institution "never flourished more than under his direction," and that he was "the best loved president whom the College has yet had."[5] Then followed a three years' mission to Charleston, South Carolina (Nov., 1818-May, 1822). Here he restored peace to a church long torn by factions and rebellions against lawful authority; and by prudence, charity, zeal, and energy once more, as Cheverus and Archbishop Maréchal

[3] Abp. Carroll to Rev. Charles Plowden, Jan. 27, 1812 (Transcript in the possession of Msgr. Peter Guilday).

[4] Bp. Cheverus to Abp. Carroll, May 9, 1815 (Balt. Cathedral Archives, 2, P 5).

[5] J. G. Shea, *Memorial of the First Centenary of Georgetown College* (Washington, 1891), 50, 53.

agreed, achieved marvels as he had done in New York.[6] For three years he then served his Order in Maryland in various positions, including a second term as President of Georgetown College (1824-5). Those three years were a lull between storms: a period of comparative rest coming between the "uninterrupted turmoil" of his life as a missionary priest and his still greater toils and trials as Bishop of Boston.

So active and talented a man, who, had, moreover, the great advantage of being a native-born American, could scarcely hope to escape the honors of the episcopate. He shrank back from them, indeed, declaring, with unconscious foresight as to his own career, that as matters were going in this country "before many years it would so turn out, that he who names a Bishop, names in the same breath a martyr."[7] But, from 1819 onward, he had been recommended to Rome by some members of the hierarchy for every bishopric that was to be filled: for Charleston, Philadelphia, Detroit, Florida, Boston, New York. For the Boston succession, which lay unsettled for over a year, there were only two serious candidates: Fenwick and the administrator whom Cheverus had left in charge, the Very Rev. William Taylor. Over the latter's merits the American bishops, in their reports to Rome, were sharply divided, but everybody bestowed "singular eulogies" on Fenwick. With habitual wisdom Rome finally rejected the Gallicized Irishman, who, though polished and talented, seems to have been vain, ambitious, and erratic. Fenwick's bull of appointment was dated May 10, 1825, and on November 1 he was consecrated in the Cathedral at Baltimore by Archbishop Maréchal, assisted by Bishops England of Charleston, and Conwell of Philadelphia. On December 3 he arrived in Boston, a total stranger to everyone, to take possession of his embryonic diocese. A little flock of about 10,000 Catholics, scattered throughout New Eng-

[6] Bp. Cheverus to Abp. Maréchal, Dec. 20, 1819 (Balt. Cathedral Archives, 14, J 33). Cf. Peter Guilday, *The Life and Times of John England* (2 vols., New York, 1927), I, 252-261.

[7] Rev. Benedict Fenwick, S. J., to Rev. George Fenwick, S. J., Jan. 14, 1823 (Archives of the Jesuit Maryland—New York Province, 206, S 2—henceforth cited as Fordham Archives).

land; three priests to look after them; nine for the most part miserable little houses of worship, only one of which "deserved the name of a church"—the Cathedral in Franklin Street, Boston; and but the meagrest financial resources to count upon—such was the situation that confronted him.

Before describing the episcopate that now began, it may be well to sketch the new Bishop.

In marked contrast to his delicate and rather tiny predecessor, Cheverus, Fenwick was built on ample lines; and his leonine form and strong, if not handsome, features seemed to radiate health, vitality, and energy. Almost to the last year of his life he could boast that he knew sickness only from seeing it in others. His personality appeared to combine the traits of four rather distinct types of men: the Southern gentleman, the scholar, the practical man of affairs, and the apostle.

The Southern gentleman appears in him in his hearty, frank, and sunny disposition; his constant jests and endless flow of genial talk; his warm-hearted hospitality; his easy and dignified bearing; his love of the country and of the out-of-doors, of guns and dogs and fishing-rods, of Maryland society and ways. Among the "Yankees" he was always something of an exile. While quite at home with a President of the United States, a Governor of Canada, or a foreign ambassador, he was evidently not deeply impressed with the social aristocracy of New England. At first he left them severely alone, and, unlike his predecessor, took no part in the social or civic life of the community. Later he seems to have felt it wise to establish more contacts with non-Catholic circles; but he never obtained, and doubtless never desired, anything like that universal and exuberant popularity that Cheverus had enjoyed among Protestants.

Fenwick's intellectual powers and attainments were of a distinctly high order. Brownson, no mean critic, declared:

> He seemed to have read everything, and to have retained all that he had read. We never, in our intercourse with him, knew a subject to be broached of which he was ignorant. . . . Upon the whole, he left on us the impression of a man of great natural powers, of varied and profound learning,

and of being the best informed man we have ever had the honor of meeting.[8]

In the ecclesiastical sciences, especially apologetics, in the classics, and in history, the Bishop was, undoubtedly, an eminent scholar. Throughout his life, the desire to write and publish haunted him. But pressing and multifarious official duties thwarted nearly all these plans, and forced him to confine his publications to compilations intended for immediate practical ends. He assisted Father John Power of New York, in editing the *Catholic Laity's Directory* of 1822. His history of his diocese down to 1829, entitled "Memoirs to Serve for the Future Ecclesiastical History of the Diocess of Boston," he was, for ten years, always about to publish, without ever finding the time to put it through the press. A *Church Music Book*, a *Book of Ceremonies*, and a large number of Catholic books and tracts reprinted under his direction complete the list of volumes that fate allowed him to bring forth. He was also a pioneer of Catholic journalism. At one time he was attempting to be the principal editor of no less than three journals for his diocese: the *Catholic Press*, of Hartford (1829-33); the *Expostulator*, of Boston (1830-31), intended for young people; and—most important of the three—the *Jesuit, or Catholic Sentinel*, of Boston, which he conducted for five years (1829-34), and which, continued under the name of *The Pilot*, now ranks as the oldest Catholic newspaper in the United States.

Unlike many scholars, Fenwick was also a practical man of affairs, a born leader and executive, richly endowed with judgment, prudence, creative imagination, energy, and initiative, and with a remarkable range of interests and aptitudes. He managed the finances of his diocese, drafted designs for new churches or colleges, got out with compass and chain to survey his land, or he planted an orchard as easily as he preached sermons, reformed Church music, edited newspapers, or wrote historical treatises. So naturally was he the master spirit in any circle in which he

[8] Orestes A. Brownson, "The Right Reverend Benedict Joseph Fenwick, Second Bishop of the Diocese of Boston," *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, III (1846), 526 f.

might be thrown that Brownson declared he never knew any other great man to surpass or equal him in this respect; and the same writer averred that he showed such practical talents in the administration of his diocese as would have fitted him to govern a nation with equal ease and success.[9]

But, above all, Fenwick was, of course, the consecrated man of God and a hero of the apostolate. From his revered mother and in the school of St. Ignatius he had gained a deep and whole-souled piety, and the secret of all perfection, *Vince teipsum*. His kindness, consideration, and charity for all with whom he came into contact were equalled only by his fortitude in the hours of trial. "Patience, patience, patience!"—the word continually crops up in his latters; and how much he had need of it! But his most outstanding trait was humility. If I may quote Brownson again:

> It gave to his whole character a placid beauty, and that inexpressible charm which made his society so delightful, and which so endeared him to our hearts. . . . Through grace his spirit had become as sweet, as gentle, as docile as that of the little child, of which our Saviour said—'Of such is the kingdom of heaven.' He had long ceased to live for himself, and he was incapable of thinking how this or that would or would not affect his own reputation. . . . He made himself nothing for Christ's sake, and was free and strong for whatever there was for him to do.[10]

It would have been hard to surpass him for zeal and activity as a shepherd of souls. Through much of his episcopate he did the work of a parish priest in his cathedral, preaching incessantly—sometimes once or twice daily throughout Lent—hearing confessions, visiting the sick and the poor, instructing converts. He traveled indefatigably about his vast diocese, to hunt up and minister to stray Catholics, to organize new congregations, launch or dedicate new churches, administer Confirmation, etc. What such traveling meant in those days it is not easy for us to imagine. He drives from Boston to Lowell with the horse up to his knees and the wheels up to the hub in mud. He travels through the forests of Maine by canoe, paddled by Indians. He journeys

[9] *Loc. cit.*, 520, 527.

[10] *Loc. cit.*, 528 f.

across the White Mountains one winter's day in "an open waggon," 50 miles through a driving snowstorm. Most of the time he was dependent upon stage-coaches, which often started at 2 or 3 A. M., and which had a sad tendency to break down, topple over, or hurl the Bishop into the road or into a pool of water. "Poor as Job's turkey";[11] so busy that "I have not even time to sneeze";[12] "It is . . . Mungo here, Mungo there, and Mungo everywhere with me"[13]—in such phrases he laughed over his trials. But always the solicitude for all the churches and the love of Christ pressed him, and through twenty-one years of rule he gave himself without stint or measure.

From a biographical standpoint, his episcopate seems to fall into three periods.

The first period (1825-33) was that of his most intense activity, of manifold and fruitful initiatives, and of mounting optimism. Thanks to a growing immigration, mainly from Ireland, the number of Catholics in Boston alone had risen in those eight years from 5,000 to over 20,000; and for the whole diocese the total by 1833 must have been well over 30,000.[14] The Bishop's hardest problem—that of obtaining priests—was being tolerably met: by training a few young men in his own household, by sending others, as soon as his finances permitted, to be educated in Canada or Maryland, and by picking up wandering clergymen from other dioceses. The total number of his priests had increased from 3 to 24. The sending of Fr. Charles Ffrench to Maine (1826), of Fr. Robert Woodley to Rhode Island and Connecticut (1828), and of Fr. Jeremiah O'Callaghan to Vermont (1830) marked the beginning of a sustained effort to spread all around the diocese a Church which had hitherto scarcely functioned regularly outside of Boston. The forming of Catholic congregations in Eastport

[11] Bp. Fenwick to Rev. George Fenwick, S. J., July 8, 1830 (Fordham Archives, 209, M 5).

[12] *Idem* to *idem*, June 2, 1834 (*Ibid.*, 211, W 10).

[13] *Idem* to *idem*, Oct. 31, 1830 (*Ibid.*, 209, K 22).

[14] These and other similar computations here are based on the Bishop's Journal ("Memoranda of the Diocess of Boston") in the Boston Diocesan Archives.

and Portland Maine; Dover, New Hampshire; Charlestown, Waltham, Lowell, Taunton, Sandwich, Massachusetts; Pawtucket, Providence, and Newport, Rhode Island; Hartford and New Haven, Connecticut, showed what rapid progress was being made in the coastal regions of New England. For the interior, too, the promise, at least, of better things might be seen in the labors of that greatest of our pioneer priests, Fr. James Fitton, who in 1828 began that series of missionary journeys which within a few years carried him throughout the six New England states. He used to jest that his parish extended from Boston to the New York State line.[15]

Meanwhile Fenwick had doubled the size of his Cathedral; pressed the organization of Sunday schools and of Catholic day schools; established the Ursulines in a beautiful convent and academy for girls on "Mount Benedict" in Charlestown (now East Somerville); brought the Sisters of Charity to Boston (1832) to lay the foundations of an orphan asylum; started *The Jesuit*; and bought a lot adjoining the Cathedral on which he was planning to found a college and seminary. No wonder that in those years he looked forward with high hopes, or that a Catholic journal declared in 1829: "We know of no part of the Union in which our Church promises so well as in New England." [16]

Then came the period of the great misfortunes—1834 to 1838. The storm of anti-Catholic fanaticism which swept over New England at that time has been described so often that I shall only recall its salient episodes: the burning of the Charlestown Convent on the night of August 11, 1834 by a band of bigots and rowdies in the presence of 4,000 people; the constant threats, provocations, and insults of the next twelve months; the chronic danger of an explosion of racial and religious war; the Catholics of Boston forced to arm themselves and turn out, night after night, to protect their churches; the farcical outcome of the trials of the Convent-burners; the refusal of the Legislature to grant any redress for the outrage; the Ursulines obliged to retire to

[15] Rev. James Fitton, *Sketches of the Establishment of the Church in New England* (Boston, 1872), 206.

[16] *United States Catholic Miscellany*, VIII (1829), 374.

Canada; the Bishop shot in effigy on August 11, 1835, and his life threatened; the "Broad Street Riot" of June 11, 1837, when the Irish quarter of Boston came near being wiped out; the mobbing of the Montgomery Guards, a newly formed Irish-American militia company, on September 12, 1837; the burning of the Catholic Church at Burlington, Vermont, presumably by excited "patriots," on the night of May 2, 1838, etc., etc. In addition, Fenwick endured in those years a series of troubles with turbulent Catholic congregations and with bad priests. There was the catastrophe at New Haven, May 8, 1834, when, at the dedication of a new church, a badly constructed gallery filled with people fell in upon a crowded congregation: two persons were killed, others injured, and the Bishop himself escaped death by the narrowest margin. Finally, there was the panic of 1837, with peculiarly devastating results for congregations largely dependent upon stagnating industries or closed mills. Thus, as Fenwick wrote in his Journal, "one calamity, it seems succeeds another." [17] He bore himself through these darkest years with remarkable patience, calmness, and fortitude. Perhaps the sublimest moment of his life was on that Sunday evening after the burning of the Convent when he gathered his exasperated flock at the Cathedral and preached to them on the text: "Love your enemies: do good to them that hate you: and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you." [18] What these anguishing years did to him we shall never fully know. He did not wear his heart on his sleeve. But after his death persons competent to judge affirmed that the destruction of the flourishing institution on Mt. Benedict—his most prized creation—was "the bitterest chalice of affliction during the whole course of his apostolic labors," [19] and "that trial which to him was indeed a sword of sorrow piercing his soul." [20] And in one revealing letter to the Bishop of Quebec Fenwick described himself as: "Persecuted, insulted, with a heart half broken and

[17] Oct. 31, 1834.

[18] *The Jesuit*, Aug. 16, 1835. Cf. Robert H. Lord, "Religious Liberty in New England: The Burning of the Charlestown Convent," *Historical Records and Studies*, XXII (1932), 7-31.

[19] *The Boston Pilot*, Aug. 15, 1846.

[20] From a sermon by Bp. Hughes, cited in *The Pilot*, Sept. 19, 1846.

laboring under all the difficulties of an infidel sect who are every day seeking to entrap us." [21]

At any rate, the clouds in great part broke away, and the last eight years of his episcopate may be described as a relatively quiet and prosperous period, during which not a few of his cherished projects were realized.

Tribulations were still not lacking. His effort to reëstablish the Ursuline Academy failed after two years (1838-40), not because of opposition from without but, to speak frankly, because of lack of harmony among the Sisters. There was still much trouble with erratic priests, and with some unruly congregations —such an epidemic of disorders, indeed, early in 1842 in certain churches at Boston, Providence, and Salem as to look like a conspiracy of malcontents. And in 1844-45 there was a new flurry of racial and religious bitterness, owing to the rise of the "Native American party."

Nevertheless, the Church in these later years was making very rapid progress. Thanks to immigration, to industrialization, and especially to the development of railroads from 1834-35 on, groups of Catholics were springing up a little bit everywhere in New England, and clamoring for priests. By 1846 the Catholics must have formed two-fifths of the population of Boston, and they now had, not one, but seven churches there. The erection of churches in such places as Bangor, Augusta and Houlton in Maine; Middlebury, Castleton and Swanton in Vermont; Worcester, Chicopee, Northampton and Pittsfield in Massachusetts, shows how Catholicism was permeating the interior of New England. Only the Granite State still remained, it seemed, almost impermeable. By 1843 it was necessary to detach Rhode Island and Connecticut to form the new Diocese of Hartford. Even after this amputation it appears, as far as one can reckon it, that by the end of the Fenwick regime the Catholic population of the Diocese of Boston had increased from 5/10,000 in 1825 to nearly 70,000 in 1846; the number of priests from 3 to 37; the number of churches from 9 to 44.

[21] Bp. Fenwick to Bp. Signay, Nov. 18, 1834 (Archiepiscopal Archives of Quebec).

Among the major successes of these last years were: the holding of the first General Retreat of the Clergy, followed by the first Diocesan Synod, in August, 1842; the opening at last of the first charitable institution, St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum, October 9, 1842; and the inauguration, November 1, 1843, of Holy Cross College at Worcester, which Fenwick in the end regarded as his greatest achievement, and in which he saw the realization of two of his fondest dreams—to have a Catholic college, and to bring into the Diocese the Society of Jesus.

In December, 1845, the Bishop's health definitively broke down from a disease of the heart. For eight months he suffered and worked on, as much as he could, calm, cheerful, playful even, up to the end. With perfect faith and fervor he made his unperturbed preparations for death; and on August 11, 1846—the anniversary of "Mt. Benedict"—he expired in the arms of his Coadjutor, Bishop Fitzpatrick, his last words being: *In Te, Domine, speravi; non confundar in aeternum.* His funeral brought out such demonstrations of universal grief and reverence from Catholics and Protestants alike as Boston had seldom witnessed. He was buried, as he had directed, in his College of the Holy Cross.

The historian may note certain defects in Bishop Fenwick's make-up and certain failures in his record. He was over-sanguine. To judge from his letters, everything that he undertook was to be the grandest thing of the kind ever witnessed. He was over-trustful. He accepted the services of so many priests from outside who turned out to be unworthy of his confidence that his close friend, Archbishop Eccleston, condemned him for "amiable although scarcely pardonable credulity." [22] When the first signs of the No-Popery movement appeared in a growing flood of slanders and tirades from certain Protestant journals and pulpits, Fenwick met it with too vigorous a counter-offensive. The fiery editorials of his paper *The Jesuit* were held even by Catholic prelates [23] to have had something to do with the burning of the

[22] Abp. Eccleston to Bp. Hughes, June 22, 1842 (New York Diocesan Archives, A 11).

[23] Rev. John Hughes (later Archbishop) to Bp. Purcell, Feb. 5, 1835 (Notre Dame Archives).

convent. Some of his plans betrayed less than his usual good judgment: e. g., his plan during the years 1838-40 to build his diocesan college and seminary at Benedicta, in the woods 80 miles north of Bangor, in just about the wildest and most inaccessible spot in New England (but Bishops Dubois and Hughes of New York at just the same period were also pursuing their LaFargeville project).

But, when all is said and done, there is no need to deny greatness either to the man or to his work. It would be hard to find a serious flaw in his character, which, in its harmony, its integrity, its nobility reminded Brownson of Washington's.[24] Favored, of course, by circumstances—the tide of immigration—he did transform one of the feeblest of dioceses into one of the strongest in the American Church at that time. He brought Catholicism into wellnigh every part of New England. A great believer in authority, he labored hard to instill discipline and high priestly ideals into the body of clergy that he created. He vigorously stamped out the germs of Trusteeism, which were not lacking here and which, more fully developed, had wrought such havoc elsewhere. He first fixed the conditions of clerical life and parochial organization, and the methods of handling diocesan business. In his zeal for Catholic education in all forms, for Catholic charities, for high standards in preaching and in public worship, for proper Church music, for spreading Catholic literature, for Catholic journalism, for organizing the laity for what would nowadays be called "Catholic Action," he did all that was possible in his circumstances and marked out paths for the future. In short, he stamped his character upon his diocese, and in the face of the gravest difficulties accomplished a magnificent and enduring work.

His trials and his successes are admirably symbolized in the coat of arms of the Fenwick family. It shows a phenix rising from the flames with the inscriptions: above, *A tous jours loyal,* and below, *Perit ut vivat.*

ROBERT H. LORD.

[24] *Loc. cit.*, 520.

MISCELLANY

HISTORY: A BARRIER OR A BLESSING*

The maker of proverbs insisted that great oaks from little acorns grow. I have never enjoyed the advantage of being an acorn; but the prospect of addressing a body of professional historians is comforting only because I now feel at least as small as an acorn. We of the journalist's estate, who must perforce keep up a semblance of interest in a large number of subjects, have perilously little time to deepen our knowledge of any one. But on the basis of a more or less persistent concern with the history of thought, I am venturing to present some reflections on certain aspects of the life of ideas in the human world. For after all, ideas, though frequently ignored by historians, seem the genuine substance of history. Even Marxists since Jaures' time have concurred in this view; and it seems, indeed, inseparable from the Christian mind.

I.

Is history a barrier or a blessing? Living in an inchoate society, wherein a greater and greater zest for group autonomy is manifested, we are all very conscious of the appeals to the past which advocates of belligerent race and nation isolation are making. A gentleman recently left a fortune to Yale in order to perpetuate the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race. French and German chauvinists—Barrès on the one hand, Moeller van den Bruck on the other—have bequeathed to our time interpretations of history which propose veritable "cults of the dead" in order to guarantee national solidarity and greatness. Hitler goes to the German past in order to dig up sanctions for a policy of rabid anti-Semitism; and forceful Jew, in order to evoke resistance to that policy, has out-Hitlered Hitler in staking all upon the "splendid isolation" of the Hebrew race in history. On all sides of us, similar phenomena are manifest. From Belfast to Ethiopia, from Canada to Terra del Fuego, philosophies of history are being fashioned with a purpose.

And yet, on the other hand, the conception that history is a common denominator—that it reveals one truth and not a plurality of mutually destructive truths—will not down. We here cling first of all to the belief that what is termed the "past" is primarily a revelation of Divine Providence operative in the world. In the hands of the All-Knowing, history is

* Paper read at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, December 28, 1935, Boston, Mass.

the log-book of a captain. Though it is and will be impossible for us to comprehend the drift of this long voyage—for all attempts from St. Augustine to Professor Spengler are only now and then satisfying—the fact of the drift itself is implicit in the Divine intelligence. We can see at least as much as this: the history of man converges upon the life and death of the Redeemer. It is a drama of sin, retribution, grace and the acceptance of grace. But it is also (and this must seem a much darker truth, though not less evident a one) the story of an ineradicable conflict between the laws which govern the cosmos and those which regulate the innate desires of man. Though such a calm perception of the unity of the past in God cannot answer all our questions, it does render others unnecessary. Nobody who possesses it will long be worried, for example, about sundry theories of spontaneous historical generation spawned by Hegel.

Secondly and concurrently, we find positive evidence of another oneness—of the continuing virility of a central civilizing force, compounded of humanistic insight and sense of form, manifest in present and the past. I think the historian who surveys the whole can discern a number of points of intellectual rest—of solutions to the ceaseless debate which has engrossed the collective intellect and will—which the best in all ages have striven to perpetuate. That is what Matthew Arnold doubtless wished to say in his famous maxim about the "best that has been known and thought in the world." Here again we cannot expect to draw a complete and detailed map, with the aid of which all our queries can be answered. It is, I think, impossible (for example) to trace a sharp line between Classicism and Romanticism, or between Aristotle and Plato, or between the Christian Platonists and the Christian Aristotelians. But one can show that the highest moment in Attic culture was Socrates, that the mind of Thomas More was a corresponding moment in English Tudor life, and that the purpose of Milton was not essential'y different from that of Erasmus. When the smoke of intellectual battle has lifted from any age, these peaks of serenity and nobleness loom high; and if the historian leaps from one such eminence to another he can form not a unity, it is true, but at all events a deep impression that unity is somehow there.

II.

If I may now look upon these prolegomena as the best that can be offered, we can proceed to a question of some importance. To what extent are the two conceptions of unity which have been offered associable? In other words:—to what extent is the Church, the visible pledge given to us of the Providential guidance of the world, also the exponent of "the best that has been known and thought in the world?" To what extent

are "Christianity" and "civilization" bound together in a necessary partnership? Please notice that the question is not whether there is coherence between Christianity and the culture of Greece, Rome, or Europe. It is rather one of the coherence of Christianity and culture-in-itself, as this last is historically revealed. We can imagine, for instance, a Christianity for which Confucius rather than Socrates would be the central pagan philosophic figure without doing violence to any essential matter.

Conversely, to what extent is an attack upon culture implicitly also an attack upon the Church? How far does the championship of a wrong idea in the humanistic realm militate against the progress and mission of Christianity? By way of very simple illustration: Shakespeare criticism during the nineteenth century was governed largely by the belief that in these plays prototypes of comic or tragic action revealed the essence of human nature. When Tolstoi and Bridges delivered their now successful assaults upon this theory, they left us all pretty generally persuaded that Shakespeare, as understood by the nineteenth century, was a fairly godless and anti-moral person. Now, does the prevalence of an erroneous point of view concerning drama which remains, after all, the nucleus of English culture as transmitted from generation to generation by the schools, have a bearing of importance upon the fate of Christianity in history?

These are momentous questions, which I cannot hope to answer. But a few difficulties which lie in the way of a successful reply may be enumerated. First and foremost, there is this:—the civilizing of any given time is inevitably a matter of growth, and growth implies growing pains. On the humanistic level, therefore, no generation is ever sure what the real essence of culture, historically regarded, is until it has found out, in its own way, through experience and has—in the process of finding—added something new to the whole. And the trouble is that until this "new thing" has finally emerged, no one can tell positively whether it is good or not. We cannot judge the cultural battle going on round about us by the rules in any handbook. Consequently we may possess an impression of the unity of civilization without being in a position to say just how phenomena contemporary with ourselves compare with this unity. And therefore the Church has wisely refrained from legislating about cultural entities, excepting in so far as a very limited number of philosophic dicta are concerned.

A second difficulty arises, of course, from the often experienced incompatibility between the highest forms of mystical fervor and the exercise of natural powers of reason and art. The saints have sometimes—notably in the case of Francis of Assisi—actually striven to go intellectually naked through the night of contemplation.

There are other difficulties, which cannot be enumerated here.

We can ignore none of them; but I think there would nevertheless be a consensus of opinion that in spite of them a link of strength and size does exist between culture and religion, and that what happens in the one realm is of importance in the other, too. The Baron Von Hügel has made this point so lucidly and effectively that the burden of proof now rests on the other side.

III.

If we accept the point as at least relatively demonstrable, a number of what may be fruitful conclusions follow. First, though we can not quite prove that in times when a certain set of humanistic principles are dominant religious authority is weakened, we can—I believe—show that the main trends of resistance to religion are comparable on the basis of humanistic history. For example: the mightiest antagonist of early Christianity was Hellenistic skepticism, which combined naturalism with the belief that anything transcending the realm of the senses is unknowable. Of necessity this skepticism was also a corrosive agent in the social order, gradually undermining the substance of the Roman state. And today the mightiest enemy of Christianity is scientific skeptical thought, which likewise blends naturalism with the dogma that anything outside the range of laboratory experiment, or even observation, is unknowable. Of necessity this skepticism is a corrosive agent in the social order, and is gradually undermining the substance of the modern state. When we compare our age with that of the decline of Rome, it is this similarity of fashionable thought-cosmoses which we really mean. The world of the Caesars broke into fragments when the majority of men no longer believed in anything, even in it; and perhaps our world is crumbling for the same reason.

Second, ideas never die. Thirty years ago, the books of Ernst Haeckel were on the study table of every emancipated soul; and the line of progress to Harry Elmer Barnes is as clear as the line of descent from Condorcet and Bayle. Seemingly there is no way in which control over idea vitality can be exercised. One can never be sure whether a Christian folk is not slowly absorbing ideas which in the end will poison it; and one is perennially amazed to find that non-Christian peoples have either conserved or somehow acquired ideas which are part of the normal periphery of belief. Jesuit missionaries of the seventeenth century were struck by the *anima naturaliter christiana* in many a savage; and in our time other missionaries often sense the same thing.

On the whole, one is inclined to suppose that when wrong concepts have once acquired social reality—that is, when they have modified the accepted code of conduct of a homogeneous group of people—nothing not supernatural can be done except to wait until they have exhausted their

energy. They take on a quasi-religious status—become, in Professor Crane Brinton's useful phrase, "active religions." Thus the dilemma of modern democracy, the choice between a mob or Caesar, certainly more than a hundred years old, is contained in the choice between the Revolution and Napoleon. No one can understand modern Europe who refuses to speculate—but not like Pareto, for example—upon the survival of the myths of Valmy and of Austerlitz. And again, no one can understand these who fails to realize the ineradicable longevity of the formulae of antiquity in the mind of European man.

Similarly, one may reasonably hold that where fairly adequate cultural outlooks survive socially, religion will not easily die out. That is why, I believe, it has never been useless to reflect upon the eventual reunion of Catholic and Protestant Christianity. Why is it true that the normal avenue to Catholicism lies through a Protestant faith, if not for the reason that Protestantism is so remarkable a conserver of Christian culture? And why is it true—like it or lump it though we may—that the convert is so powerful a ferment in Catholic life if not because he adds so much of the accidents to the substance? Protestantism is forever in danger of a religious thinness; Catholicism is visited by no greater temptation than resignation to a thinness of culture. A number of recent papal pronouncements have said all this so clearly by implication that it is worth while referring to them.

IV.

To sum up: I deeply and sincerely believe that our greatest source of aid in the conflicts thus arising is a careful, reasonable, scientific and thoughful reading of history. For a century or more, we have faced the past far too positivistically, far too relativistically. History was always supposed to "prove" something, either that everything depends upon the hero or that everything depends upon the mob. Today we have a better chance to read it as it is. Facts, facts and more facts—yes! But let us remember that a fact is not merely an act, but always and everywhere primarily an idea. If we could fix our attention upon the thought-currents visibly operative in history, we might, by objective study of their genesis and history, manage to show a larger number of persons (a) the practical efficacy of ideas, and (b) the ontological and moral character of ideas.

For instance, nothing is more gravely imperilled in society than the law. It is either a thing one may disobey if the penalty can be avoided, or a thing determined by the arbitrary fiat of a dictator, be he singular or plural. But the word "law" embraces the whole of the Catholic concept of social order. It is fundamentally an idea-stream fed by a multitude of subsidiary ideas. Just as contemporary "planners" would regulate every-

thing according to the principles of engineering, so the great Christian masters—from Augustine to Thomas to Vives—sought to control everything by "law." If we cannot soon manage to show our people what this "law" is, and what it has been in history, the fort cannot be held against a philosophy which, as Walter Lippmann has correctly said, is hostile to life itself.

I plead, therefore, not for a philosophy of history, but for a history of the ideas operative in history. Only so can the barriers everywhere arising be surmounted and the blessing conserved.

GEORGE N. SHUSTER.

ST. MARY'S OF THE SPRINGS
NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THE READING ROOM
COLLEGE LIBRARY

BOOK REVIEWS

The Catholic Encyclopedia. Revised and Enlarged Edition, Vol. I. Edited by EDWARD A. PACE, JAMES J. WALSH, PETER GUILDAY, JOHN J. WYNNE, and BLANCHE M. KELLY. (New York: The Gilmary Society. 1936. Pp. xxii, 800.)

During 1906-14 the original version of *The Catholic Encyclopedia* appeared. To a whole generation of English-speaking Catholics its value as an apologetic work can hardly be overestimated. It was at the same time to the public at large the most convenient and reliable source of information on all matters relating to Catholic doctrine and practice. We can never be sufficiently grateful to the board of editors who conceived and carried to completion an undertaking of such magnitude. Three of them—Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, Charles Herbermann, and Condé B. Pallen—have since its publication passed to their eternal reward.

It has become increasingly apparent, however, that a revised edition was badly needed. That edition is to comprise sixteen volumes, the first of which has just appeared. It marks an event of signal importance.

The first volume, covering from A to ARG, makes it evident that the new design is in many respects different from the old, that the purpose of the editors extends further than a mere revision and enlargement. Indeed, what we have now is for all practical purposes a new work.

According to the scheme of the former *Catholic Encyclopedia* only topics of specifically Catholic interest were treated. In the present edition the scope has been broadened so as to take in all matters that bear upon human society, for, as the preface put it, "All that is mooted or written in literature, history, law, pedagogy, philosophy, and the various sciences has a bearing upon religion." In other words, no line of demarcation is drawn between religion and life. The Encyclopedia, without becoming less Catholic, has become more catholic. All this is an enormous gain.

A certain number of articles of obsolete interest are now eliminated. Others have been considerably condensed. But the most noteworthy difference is the great increase in the number of topics treated. It would seem—though on this point I have made no precise computation—that they are at least double those of the old edition. For instance the articles "Aeroclinoscope," "Aeronautics," "Aertszen," "Aeschines," "Aeschylus," and "Aesop," are all new and follow one another in unbroken succession. A still longer series is that of "Appian Way," "Appiaria," "Apple," "Appleby," "Appleton," "Appointment," "Appomattox," "Apponyi,"

"Apportionment," and "Apprehension." The definition, derivation, and pronunciation of each title is a novel and admirable feature.

As a rule the new articles are briefer than the old. But this is only to say that in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* the most prominent place is naturally still given to the topics relating to Catholicism. Without strict condensation the work would have become unwieldly. That condensation, however, has the advantage of making the Encyclopedia all the more serviceable for general reference. Judging from the first volume, it is not too much to say that it is of more practical use for anyone who wishes to obtain trustworthy information in a concise form of a general sort than are any of its rivals, and that it has no rivals in English as far as the specifically Catholic articles are concerned.

The names of its editors are a guarantee of a high standard of scholarship, as are the names of its contributors. Its arrangement of material is clear; its type is easy to read; and its plates are excellent. To all the chief articles are appended valuable bibliographies. There need be no reservation in recommending the new *Catholic Encyclopedia.*

THEODORE MAYNARD.

Mount St. Mary's College,
Emmitsburg, Md.

The Muslim Creed: Its Genesis and Historical Development. By A. J. WENSINCK. (New York: Macmillan [Cambridge University Press]. 1932. Pp. ix, 304. $4.00.)

The table of contents will reveal at once to the initiated the real object of the author. There are 9 chapters, dealing, after the introduction (ch. I), respectively, with the "Pillars of Islam" and "the confession of faith" (shahāda); faith, works, and will; God and the world; the crisis of Islam and its outcome; the Fiḳh akbar I; the Waṣīyat abī Ḥanīfa; the fiḳh akbar II; the later development of the creed. The work concludes with a list of the passages of the Kuran explained in the text, the bibliography, and a general index which makes the wealth of information contained in the book more readily accessible.

As appears from this summary, Dr. Wensinck's new book is not a systematic study of Muslim theology: this has been done in a number of publications on Islam, from different points of view. What the author offers is a study of the various creeds ('aḳīda's) which came into being as a result of controversies between the different tendencies within Islam, as summaries of the orthodox faith emerging out of the discussions of the doctors. The creeds, thus, have their historical background, and therefore

mark stages in the development of doctrine, so that their study help to follow the historical development of Muslim theology.

Of the three creeds, of which Dr. Wensinck gives a complete translation and a commentary, two are connected by the tradition with the celebrated Abū Ḥanīfa (696-767) A. D.): the first fiḳh akbar and the Waṣīya. In the case of the former, the tradition shows some hesitation, and Dr. Wensinck does not maintain the direct authorship, but only holds that the text is based substantially on genuine utterances of the master (p. 122 ff.). He abandons (p. 185) the authenticity of the Waṣīya as incapable of serious defence: this text represents a later development, influenced as it is by the teaching of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (780-855 A. D.). The other great creed, the second fiḳh akbar, may go back to the middle of the 10th century A. D. (pp. 94 and 245-247). The later forms, examined in the last chapter, are rather catechisms stating the revised teaching, more or less extensively, in a more systematic form.

A fuller survey of the questions treated in this work is not possible here: this would necessitate too many explanations, doctrinal and historical, to be of any real value to the general reader. It will suffice to say that a work on Islam by Dr. Wensinck needs no commendation with specialists in Oriental or Arabic studies. Those who are not specialists in such matters may be assured that they will find this work of the Professor of Arabic in the University of Leiden most interesting and full of solid information, though not always easy to read, as it naturally supposes a certain amount of special knowledge. Nevertheless, the first chapters (I-V) will be found readily intelligible by the non-specialist. Besides, with the help of the excellent general index, the general reader will be able to satisfy his curiosity on some particular point of doctrine such as the Kuran, Faith, God, Eschatology, Resurrection, Paradise. Moreover, the author brings in Christian parallels illustrating the historical development of Muslim teaching (cf. v. gr. in the index p. 290, the references s. v. Christianity, and p. 295, s. v. John of Damascus). In passing, it might be noted that the references to John of Damascus are according to Migne's *Greek Patrology* (p. 283), and so it is in the first quotation (p. 51, 5) where Migne's volume is mentioned. But later (p. 68 ff., 137, 1) no mention is made of Migne's volume, and, besides, in places the reader is referred to the columns of Migne, elsewhere, to book and chapter. This is a minor inconvenience which could be eliminated by adapting a uniform system of reference.

EDWARD A. ARBEZ, S. S.

Sulpician Seminary,
Washington, D. C.

The Chronicle of the Slavs by Helmold, Priest of Bosau. Translated with Introduction and Notes by FRANCIS JOSEPH TSCHAN, Professor of European History, the Pennsylvania State College. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1935. Pp. xii, 321. $4.00.)

Professor Tschan's translation of Helmold's *Cronica Slavorum* supplies a long-felt want by providing means for the English reader to acquaint himself, in a good literary rendering, with one of the most important mediaeval sources of Slavic history in general, and the history of the German conquest and colonization of Wagria and Nordalbingia, down to the second half of the XIIth century, in particular.

Like all the publications that have appeared under the auspices of Columbia University in the series of the *Records of Civilisation*, the translation of the *Chronicle of the Slavs* is done with great care and thoroughness. It is based essentially on B. Schmeidler's revised edition of Lappenberg's text of the Chronicle, and is very readable. Of course, inasmuch as the first 24 chapters of the Chronicle are largely based on borrowings from Adam of Bremen's *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum*, it is its latter part—dealing with the events of the reign of Henry IV and down to the latter half of the XIIth century—which is of a particular importance as an original historical source. Nevertheless, as has been justly observed by the translator and, before him, by H. von Breska and P. Regel, the first chapters also present considerable interest. They reflect often enough Helmold's personal point of view on the events prior to the reign of Henry IV and offer interesting comments on the accounts of Adam of Bremen as well as on the material borrowed from other sources, such as *Vita S. Willehadi*, *Vita S. Anscarii*, Ekkehart's *Chronicon Universale*, and the *Annales S. Disibaldi*. The latter two sources, according to Schmeidler's opinion, were quoted by Helmold from memory and, being amplified with a considerable amount of popular legends and traditions current in the Saxon borderland in the XIIIth century, they make these first chapters very valuable.

Although it is obviously undesirable to overburden a publication with over-extensive footnotes and source references, we may remark, nevertheless, that in a work of such interest and importance a greater accuracy and thoroughness in the treatment of the critical apparatus is to be appreciated. It is rather disappointing, to quote a few instances, to find such oversights as on p. 46 note 5 where—due perhaps to a typographical error —St. Adalbert is qualified as the first Archbishop of Gnesen. St. Adalbert, 2d Bishop of Prague (consecrated in 983) and the great apostle of the Western Slavs, suffered martyrdom in April 997 at the hands of the heathen Prussians, *three years before* the Archepiscopal See of Gnesen was established by Pope Sylvester II in cooperation with the Emperor

Otto III in the year 1000. The first Archbishop of Gnesen was St. Adalbert's younger brother Gaudentius (Radym). St. Adalbert's association with the city of Gnesen is due mainly to the fact that it was in that city that Boleslaw I of Poland deposited his relics, redeemed by him from the Prussians; and they remained in Gnesen till the year 1039 when they were transported to Prague. Naccon mentioned on p. 79 is identified in note 3 on the same page on the basis of a quotation from Widukind (*Rerum gest. Sax.* iii, 50) only. This identification would have been so much more complete and better founded, had also the well known passage of Ibrâhîm ibn Ya'qûb—describing the same Naccon under the name of *Naqûr* as one of the three leading Slavic princes of his time—been quoted and the important material collected by J. Marquart (Markwart) in the II Excurs of his *Osteuropäische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge* been used. Besides it would also have been of great assistance to all students of Slavic history had there been pointed out the principal primary sources necessary for further research in a problem where every fragment of investigation is so important and welcome. The limitation of the reference to Schmeidler, Thompson, and to a short note in Widukind seems hardly justifiable in case of a problem possessing a considerable literature and easily available primary sources. The same must be said concerning the identification of the name of Soderich (p. 79, note 3). It is impossible to treat this problem without at least mentioning Lappenberg, Marquart (Markwart), and Westberg.

A brief but interesting introduction covers summarily the general background of early Slavic history, and, particularly, the history of the Baltic Slavs. It is regrettable, however, to find this introduction so greatly influenced by the highly controversial theories of J. Peisker, exposed in his chapter on the "Expansion of the Slavs" in the *Cambridge Mediaeval History* and in the well known monographs: *Die älteren Beziehungen der Slaven zur Turkotataren und Germanen* (Berlin, 1905) and *Neue Grundlagen der Slavischen Altertumskunde* (Stuttgart, 1914)—theories which, after the severe and to a great extent unanswered criticism of such leading European and American Slavists as Jagic, Berneker, Janko, Lubor Niederle and Cross, are to be approached with all the more caution and reservation.

The select bibliography (pp. 285-297), being, on the whole, quite satisfactorily and carefully composed, shows, unfortunately, a conspicuous lack of any works written in various Slavic languages, *viz.*, Russian, Polish, or Czechish. Even such a fundamental and popular work as Hilferding's *Istoriya Baltiyskikh Slavyan* is omitted, and Lubar Niederle's great work *Slovanské starožitnosti* is given only in the short French edition: *Manuel de l'antiquité Slave*, whereas the *Zivot starych slovanů* of the same author is not mentioned at all. Not less disappointing is the absence from the

bibliographical list of many essential and widely known German works having an immediate bearing on the history of Baltic Slavs, for instance, Marquart's *Osteuropäische und Ostasiatische Streifzüge,* or Westberg's translation of Ibrâhîm ibn Ya'qûb and his articles in the *Journal of the Ministry of Public Intruction* (Russian).

The translation is accompanied by a very serviceable index (pp. 301-321). The volume is of a convenient size, well printed and elegantly bound.

OLGERD P. SHERBOWITZ-WETZOR.

The Catholic University of America.

Die Koelner Kartause und die Anfaenge der Katholischen Reform in Deutschland. Von JOSEPH GREVEN. (Muenster i. W.: Aschendorff. 1935. Pp. xv, 120.)

The late Father Joseph Greven (d. Nov. 3, 1934) is noted for penetration in unravelling historical connections between apparently unrelated past events. In a series of historical studies he displayed his talents by discovering new aspects of facts or placing old problems into new light. His posthumous work on the influence of the Cologne Charterhouse upon the beginnings of the Catholic Reform in Germany keeps up the reputation of the late historian as to thoroughgoing researches into obscure origins of historical movements.

Although Father Greven limits his study to the religious influence of a single monastic house, he was able to produce a work of general importance. Both Catholic and Protestant scholars agree that the origins of the Catholic reform at the beginning of the sixteenth century must be traced to an aggressive movement which aimed at the recovery of the lost position of the Church and at the safeguarding of the age-old Catholic heritage. Likewise both Catholic and Protestant scholars are agreed that this regenerative process within the Church originated from and was sustained by the power of medieval piety which was still strongly active among the people. However, in regard to the Catholic restoration of Germany both Catholic and Protestant scholars have been unanimous in their contention that in Germany Catholic Faith was maintained and renewed by forces which almost exclusively came from other countries: from Italy and Spain, from Rome and the papal curia. The progressive forces of the German restoration are looked for and found, to the exclusion of other agencies, in the papacy, the Jesuit Society, and the Council of Trent.

According to current opinions of Catholic and Protestant historians hardly any connection may be made between pre- and post-Reformation religious life of the German people. The Catholic reform was conditioned by the decline and dissolution of the medieval Church organization

but was brought about eventually, according to those authors, by new methods which repudiated the ancient order of things, nay even upset it. Renaissance and Reformation are considered as barriers which destroyed the continuity of medieval Catholicity and are placed between pre- and post-Reformation religion in such a way that no strings may be found connecting the one with the other.

Father Greven, however, proves that the Carthusian Monks of Cologne were working for a reform long before the papal curia had undertaken that work, nay even that those monks had invited the curia to assist in that reformatory undertaking. Accordingly the Catholic restoration in Germany was the result of the development of the innate forces of Catholicism in no other way than the reform in other countries.

The influence of those Charter monks was far reaching. Cologne saved the Netherlands and even the empire to the Catholic cause. In this struggle the Charter monks exerted a decisive influence of the political leaders of the electorate. Through their ascetical books the masses were kept within the fold of the Church. The piety among the laity was so intense that comparing the devotions spread by those monks among the people with our modern popular ones we will find the latter a stunted remnant of a former healthy growth of spiritual life.

The study of Father Greven opens a new avenue to the approach of the Catholic restoration in Germany. On the whole the book is rather sketchy. The author groups his material around four authors unduly enlarging upon some topics or bearly touching upon others. We miss detailed descriptions of the devotions, confraternities and pious exercises spread and fostered by those monks. The printers who published their popular and scientific books come in for a disparaging remark, but otherwise they are completely passed over. The concluding chapter is sorely disappointing owing to the premature death of the author. In the preface the author rightly points out that "the piety of the German Middle Ages is the root and fertile soil of the Catholic Reform." Yet he could do no more than just allude to that subject. The greatest need is a thoroughgoing study of the pre-Reformation theological literature. We cannot explain the origin of the Catholic restoration in Germany without taking into account the extensive religious literature spread on the eve of the Reformation. Yet scholars have passed over this book-production which was destined to become the ferment of a Catholic revival.

JOHN M. LENHART, O. M. Cap.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

Michelangelo, the Man. By DONALD LORD FINLAYSON. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co. 1935. Pp. x, 342. $3.50.)

The author of this volume, an Assistant Professor of Art at Cornell University, states that the reason for this new work on the famous Italian artist is that "no biographer in English has yet approached this great figure fundamentally as *Michelangelo, the Man*" (vii), and that the need may be expressed in the words of Vittoria Colonna written during Michelangelo's lifetime: "Those who know Michelangelo in his works alone, know only that of him which is least perfect" (vii).

The biography of Professor Finlayson is based to a considerable extent upon the letters of Michelangelo to members of his family and his wide circle of friends, although the author gives no footnote citations to the edition of Gaetano Milanesi which his bibliography would indicate that he used. Likewise the sonnets and madrigals of the artist are quoted at length, the author employing the English translations of Symonds and Newell. It is upon the evidence of the love sonnets that Finlayson comes to the conclusion that Michelangelo *was* in love with an unknown lady in 1529 (pp. 203-209).

While the main outlines of Michelangelo's life are well portrayed the writer does not show a very thorough knowledge of the history of the period, and in some spots he falls into plain error. For example a candidate for the Sacred College is not "consecrated" a cardinal, the term Professor Finlayson uses for the elevation of Cardinal Giovanni de'Medici to that body (pp. 31-32). Surely more than "half" Europe belonged to the Catholic Church during the pontificate of Alexander VI (p. 72). Then to find a writer of this period repeating the story of the death by poison of Alexander VI (p. 72) and the choice bit of gossip related about the funeral of the pope from an unnamed chronicler, after the thorough researches of Pastor and the refutation of these stories in his *History of the Popes* (VI, 132-137), makes one feel Professor Finlayson would have been more fortunate had he used the scholarly Pastor in place of the volume by Vaughan, cited in the bibliography, as a background for the papal history of the age. Finally his knowledge of English history is not too happy. Wolsey most certainly was a candidate for the tiara in the conclave of 1521, though the author states he was not, since he "was too busy feathering his nest in England . . . to enter the lists" (p. 186). Again Henry VIII could hardly have been committing adultery with Anne Boleyn in 1521 (pp. 187-188) when that young woman was recalled from the French court only on the eve of war between England and France in 1522.

The volume, despite these criticisms, has merit. One of its finest features is that of the twenty illustrations carefully selected to show not only the

chief masterpieces of Michelangelo, but also pictures of the best extant portraits of the great figures of Michelangelo's age such as Vasari's "Lorenzo de'Medici," Fra Bartolomeo's "Savonarola," and Titian's "Pope Paul III." They are about as fine a set of illustrations as the reviewer has seen in a work of this kind. Incidentally the high opinion held by Michelangelo of Cellini (p. 306) would seem to do something to raise that rascal in the estimation of readers of the period, as St. Thomas More's persistent regard for Erasmus has helped the old humanist with posterity. There are defects in format that should be noted. Uniformity of spelling has not been preserved; for example "Giovan Simone" (p. 66) and "Giansimone" (p. 67); "despatch" (p. 161) and "dispatch" (p. 164), etc. Neither is there uniformity in the arrangement of quotations and citations from Michelangelo's correspondence (pp. 171, 297-298, p. 331), etc. The reviewer noticed eleven typographical errors the most important being the date "1433" for "1533" (p. 226), and "Paul II" for "Paul III" (p. 260). A bibliography of twenty-four items, mostly secondary works, and a satisfactory index accompany the volume.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS.

Sulpician Seminary,
Brookland, D. C.

The Catholic Revival in Italy, 1815-1915. By Rev. H. L. HUGHES, M. A. (Oxon), D. Litt. (Pisa). (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 1935. Pp. xii, 164.)

This slight volume makes an attempt to sketch the revival of Catholicism in Italy from the Congress of Vienna to the World War in 164 pages. Obviously it can be no more than a sketch. The book contains a Preface by Camilla Pellizzi, Professor of Italian Studies in the University of London. It is divided into three parts in the first of which, entitled, "Catholic Leaders," a glance is taken at figures such as Manzoni, Pius IX, John Bosco, and Toniolo; Part II deals with "Opponents of the Church: and the Catholic Reaction"—again a mere glance at Cavour, Mazzini, and Carducci, with mention of the rôle of Toniolo, the organization of Catholic Action springing from the Gioventù Cattolica Italiana founded in Bologna in 1868, etc.; Part III concludes with a few pages on Balbo, Gioberti, and Rosmini, and the contemporary Italian Catholic leaders such as Gemelli. The book contains a Chronological Table of the main events in the political and religious history of Italy from 1815 to 1915; likewise a short bibliography of works on the subject, all in Italian. A satisfactory index is included. The reviewer noticed only one typo-

graphical error: at the bottom of p. 125 one should read "1814" for "1914."

Is it not somewhat doubtful that books of this kind fill much of a need? The author reveals that he has read rather widely in the literature of the period, but why then did he not give us a solid treatment of the subject? Furthermore it remains disconcerting to the historian—concessions to the popular reader notwithstanding—to find quotation after quotation from primary sources without any footnote references to the place where they can be found. Lastly this work of Father Hughes adds little or nothing to our knowledge of the subject of 19th century Italian Catholicism, but perhaps the author had no intention of making any original contribution.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS.

Sulpician Seminary, Washington, D. C.

Saint Bede, the Venerable. By H. M. GILLETT. (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, Ltd. 1935. Pp. x, 111. 2/6.)

This little book is a timely remembrance of the twelve-hundreth anniversary of the death of Saint Bede, the Venerable, at the monastery of Jarrow, in 735. No life among the early English scholar-saints is more attractive, in its qualities of sanctity, wisdom, and fine balance, than his. Anscar Vonier, Abbot of Buckfast, writing the preface to this study aptly remarks that Saint Bede is representative of Christian Anglo-Saxon life in its springtide; and it is indeed fitting that the Church should celebrate his feast in the month of May.

To us, caught up in the complexities of modern life, there is a deep refreshment in the very thought of the tranquil life of Bede spent in calm retirement in the monastery of Jarrow, by the Tyneside. He epitomizes the ideal of the scholar-monk; he writes of himself: "In between the observing of regular discipline and the daily duty of singing at church, I had always delight in teaching, in learning, and in writing." How better could the joys of the scholar's life be summarized than in the simple words: "the delights of teaching, of learning, and of writing?" But it is significant to remark that in Bede's own eyes, scholarly attainment was secondary to, was a mere complement to, his religious duties and his spiritual exercises. He was a scholar, the greatest of the early English scholars, but first and foremost we must remember him as a monk and a man of God.

One cannot write a great deal about the life of Bede because his was a life of prayer and thought, in which exterior activity played a very small part, since he spent his entire life within the walls of Jarrow.

Furthermore, even our information about the principal events in his life is uncertain. This work of Gillett is a satisfactory introduction to Saint Bede and records the meager facts with simplicity and directness. However, there is little emphasis placed on Bede's influence on the Middle Ages and on the development of the English Church. The study is divided into seven chapters. The first, "Bede's England," gives a short sketch of the beginnings of Christianity in England, the work of Augustine and of Theodore of Tarsus, the reconciling of the Roman and Celtic forms of worship at the Synod of Whitby in 664, and very important for Bede, the work of Saint Benedict Biscop in founding the monastery of Wearmouth and later that of Jarrow. Other chapters are devoted to Bede's education, to his home at Jarrow, to his life there, to his writings and to his death. The description of Bede's death, written by an eye-witness, Cuthbert, later Abbot of Wearmouth, one of the saint's pupils, still survives; it is a touching thing, which shows the old scholar, finishing the dictation of a book with a breath that is literally his last. There is a final chapter on "The Recusant's Bede."

One does not demand literary elegance in a small work of this sort. One could wish, however, for a greater clarity of style, for a more lucid use of language. A sentence such as one on page 25: "But it is characteristic of Saint Bede that so much in his life is obscure and yet in that life to achieve so much," is not a sentence and is not English.

There is neither index nor table of contents, although bibliographical references are listed at the end of each chapter. There is a three-page list of further readings on Bede following the last chapter. One closes the book with a feeling of disappointment. The author has not done justice, even in a small way, to this saint, whose life is so full of ancient sweetness, whom Dante places in his Paradise in company with Saint Thomas, Albertus Magnus, and Isidore of Seville, and of whom Holinshed, impressed by the tradition of Bede's great learning, but quite misinformed about his actual life, writes: "I have read that John of Beverly was the first doctor that there ever was in Oxford, as Bede was in Cambridge." However, as a short and easily-read introduction to the life of Bede, this book by H. M. Gillett will serve its purpose and will sufficiently mark the twelfth centenary of the passing of a great English saint.

LÉON BAISIER.

The Catholic University of America.

Five Centuries of Religion. By G. G. COULTON. Volume III: *Getting and Spending.* (Cambridge: at the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. li, 747. $12.50.)

As the sub-title party indicates, this third volume in the series is concerned with medieval monastic means of "getting" (the first 352 pages) and "spending" (pp. 353-599) wealth. An appendix of ninety-six pages consists mostly of source citations of varying lengths to support charges made in the respective paragraphs of the text. There is also a statistical table of monastic population for the period 1098 to 1792 covering English houses and some German and French establishments. A bibliography of authorities and a copious and good index begins and ends the work respectively.

The volume is done in the usual manner of Professor Coulton. There is the usual wealth of documentary support, the usual one-sided presentation of evidence and the usual slighting of anything that may tell against his thesis. The most serious general objection to the work is its misleading title. A really accurate title would read: "Five Centuries of Monastic Abuses." The sub-title, too, is partially inaccurate. He is concerned only with the questionable or dishonest means of which he could find record. He says nothing, for instance, of the part played in monastic decline by royal confiscations and taxation. Could he find no record in his extensive research of King John's seizures of the revenues of eighty-one alien houses, of Edward I in 1294 demanding one half the income from their benefices and his seizure of about one hundred alien houses after the publication of *Clericis Laicos*? Is nothing to be said about the alternate restorations (at a price) and seizures of these houses under Edward II and III and Henry IV and V? On one occasion the authority of the late Professor Willard is cited. It is unfortunate that he did not make a more liberal use of this scholar's findings, particularly in regard to royal taxation and its effect upon the Church in England.

On page 353 we read "Our own generation is increasingly, and justly, critical of facile generalizations. . . ." In view of that statement it may not be amiss to remark that this is an all too frequent fault in the volume. Where, for instance, is the logic in the statement on page 3: "And here, in Orderic's case, we see that monasticism, even at its strongest, *seldom* succeeded in obliterating national sentiment." Probably, however, the most amazing lack of logic is contained on pages 465 to 467.

Often, too, the author allows his patriotic pride to run away with discretion. Thus, he "feel(s) no doubt that Church endowments lent themselves, from generation to generation, to abuses which were far from ceasing at the Reformation, but which would not be tolerated for a single day in modern Britain" (p. 231). One wonders what the author thinks

of conditions in the Established Church of the eighteenth century and of the underlying causes of the much more recent "Tithe Wars" on the Isle of Wight and elsewhere in modern Britain. On page 443 his attempt to fashion a halo for his hero Henry VIII leads to a decidedly astounding logical feat by making an illation from *commendae* to the harem (*sic*) of Francis I and back again.

Another failing repeatedly manifested is a tendency to accept such statistics as support his views and to condemn in the same breath the credulity of others for doing the same "whenever the figures go to support a thesis" (p. 449). On this same page while rejecting one set of figures given by Fitz-Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh, he seems to make no difficulty in accepting another set in favor of his thesis. Immediately following he voices an objection which is patently based on the confusion of the city and diocese of Norwich.

The various and inevitable minor inaccuracies which occur will be readily perceived and the informed and unprejudiced reader will likewise note the underlying hostility to the subject treated. In fact the impression distinctly created is that when the final volume in the series has been produced the curious will have at hand what has been called a "halo or halter" history of the period 1000-1500; the halter for the monks and the halo for Henry VIII.

CHARLES E. SCHRADER, S. J.

University of Detroit.

Charles I and the Court of Rome: A Study in 17th century Diplomacy. By GORDON ALBION, Docteur en Sciences historiques (Louvain). With a Foreword by David Mathew, M. A., Litt. D. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 1935. Pp. xxxix, 451. 15 *s.*)

The strange story of the Stuarts has in the past suffered as much from the over-exuberant apologist as from the frankly hostile Whig historian, steeped in the Protestant tradition. Late years, however, have revealed a tendency to vindicate certain much-maligned members of the family in more reasoned studies, which, while recognizing their faults, give full value to their excellent qualities, so often balked by the implacable opposition of their enemies. This new view can be seen to advantage in the balanced studies of Arthur Bryant on Charles II, and of Hilaire Belloc, Mrs. F. M. G. Higham, and Joshua Brookes on Charles I.

So much for the critical re-shuffling of well-known facts. In the volume under review one sees the same attempt at unbiased judgment, but applied to much that is new—the result of the author's microscopic researches among the Vatican and Propaganda Archives, and the Bar-

berini MSS. of the Vatican Library, to which last he was apparently compelled to go by the incompleteness of the Roman Transcripts in the London Public Record Office.

The fruit of such searchings is a close study of the relations between Charles I and the papacy—a field hitherto not fully explored.

Dr. Albion's study, which is introduced in an apt foreword from the pen of Dr. David Mathew, author of *The Celtic Peoples and Renaissance Europe,* was presented recently at the University of Louvain as a thesis for the doctorate in historical sciences, and bears the hall-mark of the careful workmanship and erudition that one looks for as a matter of course from students writing in close contact with Professor van der Essen and Canon De Meyer, worthy upholders of the tradition begun by the late Canon Cauchie. The well-documented notes receive excellent support from a full bibliography of archival and literary sources and modern works. Four among the eleven appendices appear to us as having a particular interest. First, there is a full treatment (of chapter length) of the artistic relations between Charles I and the Barberini, wherein an outline is given of the history of the Van Dyck Triple Head of Charles, sent to Rome to be copied in marble by the great Bernini; fine reproductions of both are among the seven illustrations of the book. Next, there is an account of Rome's influence on Charles's conception of the *de jure divino* origin of the episcopate—a doctrine for which he fought and died. Thirdly, the Reunion chapter is well served by the addition of a document of extreme interest—the papal agent's report on the twenty-five archbishops and bishops of the Anglican hierarchy. Lastly, a trenchant and hitherto unpublished critique of the Anglo-Roman negotiations has a special interest coming as it does from the pen of Henry Howard of Corby, a well-known Catholic of emancipation days: the letter is addressed to Lingard. The whole work is excellently served by a combined name-and-subject index of considerable detail.

JOSEPH B. CODE.

The Catholic University of America.

Catholic Church Property. By Rev. P. J. DIGNAN. (New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons. 1935. Pp. vi, 285. $3.00.)

This work is a real important contribution to the study of American Church history. It is a comprehensive and critical treatise on the history of the legal incorporation of Catholic Church property in the United States since 1784. But the work is broader than a mere compilation of legal factual situations, for the author has not only given a careful analysis of the law, but, as well, a colorful series of American historical

scenes, and a penetrating interpretation of the forces of tradition, historical difficulties, prejudices, personalities, and political movements which caused the ebb and flow of tides of religious feelings which shaped legislation affecting the status of church corporations and the tenure of ecclesiastical property.

The study contains an historical account of colonial religious backgrounds, traces the development of state laws in regard to Church property incorporation, compares the canonical with the civil law precepts, and completes the work with the present statutory provisions governing the tenure of church property. A list of cited cases, index, and rich bibliography supplement the study.

The material covered is wider than the field of Catholic Church property, for often the matters of incorporation and the provisions relating to the holding of church property extend to other churches as well. The author demonstrates that the subject of church property was not a mere addendum to Church status, but rather a matter of primary importance which gave legislatures much concern and the people matter for public demonstration. The volume should appeal not only to clerical and legal readers, but to anyone interested in past and contemporary Church history.

One meets in many places in this work such unusual, interesting bits of information as, "In 1659, the celebration of Christmas was abolished in Mass. as savoring 'Popery'" (p. 17); and the New York law of 1700 ordained that "every Jesuit and 'Popish' missionary, remaining in a colony or coming in after 1700 should be deemed and accounted an incendiary and disturber of the public peace and safety and an enemy of the true Christian religion and shall be adjudged to suffer perpetual punishment. This law was not repealed in the colonial period" (p. 26).

The writer has added to the historical material a scholarly exposition of the theory and law of the Church concerning the moral personality of church entities and their powers and limitations in the matters of acquiring, holding, and disposing of ecclesiastical property.

ROBERT J. WHITE.

The Catholic University of America.

The Spanish Missions of Georgia. By JOHN TATE LANNING. Illustrated by Willis J. Physioc. Foreword by F. Merton Coulter. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1935. Pp. xi, 321. $3.00.)

Students of history have long noted the gap in the historical accounts of the southeastern part of the United States. The first sixty years of

the white man's contact with the mainland have been fittingly described in *The Spanish Settlements within the Present Limits of the United States,* by Woodbury Lowery, and in *Ensayo Cronologico para la Historia de la Florida,* by Gonzles de Barcia and others; but we have only brief accounts for the period from 1574 to 1763. Lanning's volume on the missions in Georgia is a distinct contribution toward filling the gap in the history of the southeast. While the title indicates the missions mentioned in this book are in Georgia, it is well to note that what is now called Georgia was a part of the whole southeastern section of the present United States, known as Florida long before Oglethorpe came.

The author portrays the efforts of Spain to develop her claim to the territory along the eastern section of the United States by means of the missionary and the soldier. It was a real and long though ineffective attempt. It failed because Spain never effectively colonized with settlers the immense territory she claimed. One quickly learns from the pages of this book how inadequate were the presidio and the mission to hold the land to Spanish allegiance when the Indians went on the war path, and more particularly when the more strongly settled colonial neighbors began to encroach.

It is interesting to read of the missionary activities around the Potomac almost two score years before John Smith. It will be a surprise to many to realize that fully a century and a half before the advent of Oglethorpe, Georgia had a stirring mission history. Lanning's book gives a view of these activities. He traces the work of the Jesuits, who came with Menendez, and of the Franciscans who, after them, labored so long in this field. On the whole the author is very sympathetic with the work of the missionaries. One comes away from his book with a distinct liking for the work of the Franciscans. However, some may gather the wrong notion from Lanning regarding the Jesuits. One might think from reading the chapter, "The Failure of the Jesuits," that the Jesuits gave up the Florida field because they were discouraged. Lanning does not say that in so many words but he does say, "The Duke Francisco de Borja when informed of the death of Segura, placed Father Pedro Sanchez over all the Jesuits in Havana and Florida. Sanchez ordered his charges to Mexico" (p. 57). Fr. Michael Kenny in his *Romance of the Floridas* says that the Jesuit General St. Francis Borgia had issued instructions before his death, looking to the abandonment of the Floridas. "It was not the disasters to his Fathers at Ajacan" [Segura and companions] "that so determined him for he had written to that effect the previous year" (p. 296).

Moreover Lanning says that the "Propositor General Francisco de Borja in withdrawing the Jesuits from Florida in 1572 was but express-

ing the apathetic attitude of Spain towards the mainland" (p. 59). Kenny more correctly says that the withdrawal was made because more effective and more fruitful work could be done in another field—Mexico (*Romance of the Floridas*, p. 296).

Analyzing the contents of the book we quickly see that the greater part of the 238 pages of text centers around the mission history from 1566 to 1606. Indeed at page 160 the story is carried up to Altamirano's episcopal visitation in 1606. The rest of the story down to 1728 is contained in the remaining 78 pages. Clearly then the heart of this book centers around the years 1566-1606. This is not said to belittle the work of the author but to point out that a definitive volume on the later years is still to be written. No one however will fail to appreciate the research the author has done in gathering material for this book, even allowing for the fine lead given him by Mary Ross in her various articles in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly*. Some fifty pages of notes taken from a wide range of source material give evidence of his industry.

In some respects the author shows a lack of familiarity with the terms employed by the Catholic Church. Thus he sometimes calls the Jesuits, "friars." Words like "prelate" and "absolution" which carry a very definite signification in Catholic literature are not used with precision. The author seems not entirely acquainted with the idea of ecclesiastical jurisdiction when he says, "Georgia, being a part of Florida had its more significant interests directed from Spain although Florida fell within the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Cuba who had confirmatory powers for the mainland" (p. 33). This is obscure. The fact is Georgia being a part of Florida was in the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Cuba and the powers exercised were those of an Ordinary, not merely "confirmatory."

We doubt very much whether all the data concerning these missions has been brought out as Lanning would seem to indicate in his preface. Fr. Kenny's *Romance of the Floridas*, not mentioned in this work, presumably because it was in press when Lanning was finishing his work, has interesting details on the Jesuits that *The Spanish Missions of Georgia* does not contain. Likewise the *Historical Records and Studies*, Vol. XXV, of the United States Catholic Historical Society, brings to English readers a translation of several documents concerning the Jesuit activities in Florida. Rev. Ruben Vargas Ugarte, S. J., a Jesuit professor at the Gregorian University in Rome, brought these to light. Moreover, Mrs. Jeanette T. Connor at the time of her death was working on a two-volume history of the missions. We understand that this work is now being carried forward by Mary Ross. Is there no hope for more material on the missions especially for the years after 1606 from this quarter? Then admitting the examination made by Perez of the Cuban

archives, can we say that the episcopal archives of Havana have been thoroughly examined?

The pen sketches in this work give it an added value but two of the illustrations—that of the martyrdom of Fr. Martinez (p. 210) and that of the death of Fr. Segura (p. 52), are a reproduction with very slight changes of two pen sketches used by John Gilmary Shea in his *History of the Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (pp. 140 and 145 respectively). In that work Shea says the sketches are from Tanner, *Societas Militans*. The large map in this volume is a good aid but its usefulness might be increased if on it modern names of places were mentioned. One reads in the text about a mission near Cumberland Island but it is not possible to find Cumberland Island on the map for only the ancient Spanish names are given. Notwithstanding all these criticisms every student in this field owes a debt of gratitude to John Tate Lanning for his part in bringing further light on a glorious if long hidden mission history.

MICHAEL J. CURLEY, C. SS. R.

Esopus, N. Y.

Saint among Savages: the Life of Isaac Jogues. By FRANCIS TALBOT, S. J. (New York and London: Harper Brothers. 1935. Pp. ix, 456. $3.50.)

It was to be expected that Father Talbot would approach the task of recording the life of one of the glories of his Society with the reverence and the enthusiasm which on the one hand would lend fire and unity to his work, but on the other might imperil its objectivity. The student who begins by asking, How detached is this study? How impartial is it? may find some evidence of a tendency to idealization: for example, the cheerful heroism of Saint Isaac in the most appalling situations seems almost too consistent to be human; and some may wonder whether he did not have his moments of weakness, such as the one described by a Dutch eyewitness whose version is relegated to a note (page 448) because in Father Talbot's opinion it conflicts with better testimony. But it is precisely this superhuman fortitude, observed and confirmed in countless instances, that distinguishes a saint from other men. And as one progresses in this fascinating and powerful work, there is increasing evidence of the detachment of a mind scrupulously fair and well-balanced. The historical background is sketched swiftly, concisely, with cool objectivity; there is no attempt to palliate the Saint Bartholemew's Eve massacre at Orleans, or to forget, on the other hand, that the Calvinists had given provocation in kind. And though the responsibility of the Dutch for the persecution of Catholic priests by the Indians is made plain enough, the portraits of even such

minor characters as the Huguenot Labatie and the Dutch Directors, Kieft and Van Corlaer, are painted warmly and sympathetically, and remain in the mind of the reader, with some of the Indian antagonists, as fine examples of keen unprejudiced reporting. The heart of the book, of course, is the unfolding in action of the character of Jogues. A harrowing account it is, with no flinching from reality, however gruesome; but here it cannot be said, as Professor Babbitt observed of one of Dreiser's novels, that we are harrowed to no purpose, for the accumulative effect is like that of a great Passion play, in which, though Jogues remains an individual whom we know to the soul, the real hero (as in all truly Christian art) is Christ Himself, reënacting the drama of Calvary among the bloodthirsty Mohawks; and all this in the form of interesting narration, without tedious explanation, discussion or sermonizing.

The style is simple and lucid, sometimes too staccato perhaps, but clearly the work of a man who is a poet as well as an historian; and it is frequently moving, as in the excellent piece of reconstruction from several fragmentary accounts on pages 268 and 269, wherein the saint, in peril of his life, is searching for the bones of his martyred friend to give them reverent burial. The format of the book is excellent; the index uncommonly full and detailed; the bibliography complete and serviceable; the notes, though not sufficiently indicated in the text, concise and illuminating. We have here, on the whole, a vital and scholarly book that will remain for some time an indispensable standard on the life of Saint Isaac.

WILLIAM THOMAS WALSH.

New York City.

The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana (1700-1763). By Rev. JEAN DELANGLEZ, S. J. (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America. 1935. Pp. xxvi, 547.)

The reverberations of the interesting but bitter controversy over the "Chinese rites" and a foreboding of a repetition of the difficulties in the Illinois country over the exclusive care of the Indians, determined the earliest French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana to petition the too reluctant Bishop of Quebec to grant them a separate mission field with a vicar general of their own. Their request was refused, and the first four years' activity of these missionaries was brought to a close. This was the first difficulty and it was not until some twenty years later that the mission was founded. During this intervening period, but few Jesuits visited or remained any time in the colony. Trouble began again with the founding of the mission by Father Beaubois, whose friendship for Bienville and insistence on back payment for certain "constructions illinoises" proved

too much for the Company of the Indies, which on various pretexts had him recalled. There was still more in store for the nascent mission. On the retrocession of Louisiana to the crown, Father Beaubois again returned, only to find himself and his fellow Jesuits in New Orleans subjected to an interdict. Again his superiors recalled him. The final difficulty came when the new Bishop of Quebec established as his vicars general the Jesuits and not the Capuchins, who had hitherto held the office. This controversy ended only within four years of the suppression of the Society of Jesus in Louisiana, which subject incidently forms the nucleus of perhaps the best chapter of an excellent book.

The book is about the Jesuits and takes their side in the discussions. In the studious consideration given to each point of the various disputes, documentation and scholarship are certainly outstanding analities. Perhaps as interesting, and equally well treated, are the chapters on the activities of the Jesuit missionaries at the French outposts and among the Indians. The same difficulties as were met by their Canadian brethren had to be overcome—the bad example of the French, the brandy trade, and the Indians themselves.

The book is undoubtedly a defence of the Jesuits, and probably meant as a "companion volume" to Vogel's "The Capuchins in French Louisiana— 1722-1766" (Washington, D. C., 1928). We trust that it will receive the success it so well deserves.

JOSEPH R. FRESE, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

The Ark and the Dove: The Beginning of Civil and Religious Liberties in America. By J. MOSS IVES. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1936. Pp. x, 435. $3.50.)

Mr. Ives's book is something more than a record of Maryland beginnings; it is a deliberate exposition of the thesis that the civil and religious liberties which Americans enjoy are due to Maryland influence, especially as exercised (in the case of religious liberty) through the medium of three outstanding figures, Archbishop John Carroll, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and Daniel Carroll. One may not always agree with the author's interpretations, which at times appear overwrought, but fresh, lucid and lawyer-like handling of the data makes the work a readable one from cover to cover. Some inaccuracies have crept into the text. There was no seventeenth-century English Jesuit, Father Henry Moore, (p. 217) distinct from Father Henry More, the great-grandson of the canonized chancellor, nor was the Society of Jesus founded to combat Protestantism (p. 65). James Wilson, however great his contributions to American jurisprudence, was certainly ill-advised when he challenged Blackstone's definition of law,

which is the correct one according to all scholastic teaching on the subject. To see in it "the divine right of kings" or something "subversive of all just government," is patent misinterpretation, while the idea that there can be human law of any kind "without a superior" is obviously inadmissible (p. 415). Wilson was a keen thinker, but his usual acumen failed him on this occasion. It is a misapprehension of the facts to write (p. 217) that the Baltimore-Jesuit controversy ended with the Jesuits acquiescing entirely in Cecil Calvert's demands and surrendering all their landed properties in Maryland to the state. This was the very thing they protested they could not do in conscience and did not do as the documents in Hughes abundantly witness; not a little of the very land they acquired or held by legal grant against Cecil Calvert's protest remains in their hands to this day. There is no documentary warrant for the statement that the Jesuit Provincial in England "prepared and had executed a release in full of all lands acquired and all right to acquire lands from the Indians and all domains held in the province either by Indian grant or by grant to any person for the use of the society" (p. 217).

All in all, Mr. Ives has made an excellent contribution to the literature of an absorbing subject, for which not only the general reader but all serious students of American government and its basic principles may well be grateful.

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN, S. J.

Loyola University,
Chicago, Ill.

Nevada: A History of the State from the Earliest Times through the Civil War. By EFFIE MONA MACK, Ph. D. (Glendale, Calif.: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1935. Pp. 495. $6.00.)

The Great Basin that lies between the Rocky Mountains and the Sierra Nevada passed through an interesting evolution during the middle decades of the nineteenth century. Politically it began as a vast unexplored expanse of mountainous desert lying within the confines of Spanish and Mexican territory. Lost by Mexico to the United States, the area fell within the zone of influence of the Mormon colony about Great Salt Lake, became part of Utah Territory, then, after a period of chaos, a separate territory. Finally, during the Civil War and because of circumstances attending it, the young territory became the state of Nevada.

Although the population never has been large, the story of Nevada's exploration and settlement is one of the most gripping incidents of the movement known as the winning of the West. The Spaniard never found time to penetrate Nevada. He was content with skirting its southern

borders or, in later year, crossing its southern extremity on his way from Santa Fé to the Pacific coast. Jedediah Strong Smith, fur trapper, was the first white man known to have crossed and explored the interior of the Great Basin, 1826-1827. Thenceforth, the streams became the rendezvous of British and American trappers. The discovery of gold in California brought thousands of fortune seekers trooping West. Nevada became the rough and trying highway to the diggings. Mormon settlers came to dwell in the western valleys under the Sierras and to trade with the travelers. They were soon recalled to Utah, due to the troubles between the Mormons and the United States government, but their place was almost immediately taken by the thousands who rushed back from California to Nevada following the great discoveries of gold and, especially, of silver in the Comstock region. Soon thousands were feverishly occupied in taking out the rich ore, the barren wastes were quickly dotted with mining camps, and the valleys along the rivers were taken up for agriculture.

Such is the story that Dr. Mack tells in her book. Much of her material can be found in other and earlier histories, but an enormous amount of new information has been made available for the first time as a result of her investigations. Former histories of Nevada have been largely commercial ventures or romantic popularizations not too much preoccupied with accuracy. Here we have for the first time an orderly arrangement of scattered and ill-digested materials critically presented by a competent, trained historian. Hers is the only real history of the period; a vast improvement over the now antiquated work of H. H. Bancroft and the weak efforts of amateurs and "hack writers."

Worthy of note are Dr. Mack's treatment of Indian problems, her study of the development of transportation and communication, and the part played by Nevada's votes and Nevada's silver in the Union triumph during the Civil War. The reviewer feels that her study of Nevada's constitution might be more complete. A fuller treatment than she gives will be found in Congressman Scrugham's recent *History of Nevada.*

From the point of view of religious history, Dr. Mack's book is unimportant. Except for her treatment of the Mormons, in which she is very complete and very fair, she is strangely silent. She is to be commended in that the old bitterness of earlier histories towards the Mormon group has been replaced by calm, considerate treatment. Nevertheless, present religious institutions in Nevada, both Protestant and Catholic, had their beginnings at the end of the period she studies, yet she ignores them. A practical explanation may be found in the fact that materials were scanty and hard to find, but the older histories contain considerable information. It is possible, too, that she considered this phase of Nevada life as belonging to a later period.

As it suffers by absence of a study of religious institutions, so Dr. Mack's

book might have been improved by a chapter on social and moral conditions and some treatment of national and racial origins of the early population of Nevada.

Her task was made difficult by the fact that she is a pioneer in the field of scientific history of Nevada, that there are practically no monographs dealing with particular and local history, and that public and private archives are inadequate and poorly organized. Yet in spite of these handicaps, Dr. Mack has given us a worthwhile history of Nevada up to the Civil War and statehood.

✠ THOMAS K. GORMAN.

Reno, Nevada.

Roger B. Taney. By CARL BRENT SWISHER. (New York: The MacMillan Co. 1935. Pp. x, 608. $5.00.)

One lays aside this volume with this thought uppermost in his mind: Carl Brent Swisher has, by his scholarship, style and fidelity to facts, given to our American youth, in this biographical study of Chief Justice Taney, a fine and worthwhile lesson in character formation. Taney as a lawyer, as a judge, and as a man, is depicted, in the twenty-seven chapters making up this timely volume of 609 pages, as an ideal citizen worthy of study and imitation. The author presents Taney in the midst of those stormy times of a century ago, and makes us see how he fitted into his environment, and at the same time, by the outstanding plasticity of his nature, helped to shape that environment and prepare it to be the explanatory historical background of problems that would be otherwise so knotty, tangled and seemingly insoluble today.

The first few chapters give us a picture of the early life of the second Chief Justice of the United States. The author points out the long line of Catholic ancestry from which he sprung in Calvert County, Maryland. He gives us an insight into his heritage as a cultured Southern gentleman, which, like his religion, is one of those precious possessions that he never took to market yet which was a dominating influence on his noble and useful career.

I think the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 24 has in it a lesson every father and every friend of every father should learn by heart and practice. It is one of those mighty forces for the direction of the young that is sadly neglected and sorely needed today. Guided by a fatherly advice and the stirring stories of his father's friends, the youthful Taney began the study of law in the office of J. T. Chase, in 1796, in Annapolis. Three years later he was admitted to the Bar. The account of his first case, as given on pages 28 and 29, will stimulate any youthful

lawyer and buoy him up to dare the right regardless. The Gruber case, on pages 95, 96 and 97, shows Taney at his best as a youthful lawyer. As a lawyer, and as a motto for all future lawyers, it was said of him that "while zealous for his clients, he was always just toward his opponents"; only a lawyer with a conscience can appreciate the full import of this.

As a judge, Taney rectified the views of Marshall and built them into greater harmony with the original plan of the Constitution. The many and subtle decisions he rendered during the twenty-eight years he honored the position of Chief Justice can be fully appreciated after a perusal of this admirable biography of Taney. The bitter political quarrels of the Jackson administration are adequately portrayed and aid in bringing out the fine qualities of Taney's character. The Bank of the United States' fight and its final outcome is but one of the many achievements of Taney during those stressful years. Swisher has done more than a service to Taney in his account of this historic incident—he has done him justice. Perhaps the most soul-stirring event of Taney's career as a judge was his verdict in the well-known Dred Scott decision. Was he denounced for this decision? Yes, with a political malignity that knew no bounds. Time has softened this verdict, and the author of this life has forced Taney's foes to flight. Chapter XXIV deals with this problem in a most commendable manner. Among the many other decisions given by Taney while he was Chief Justice, none stands out as does the Merryman case (the Habeas Corpus case). President Lincoln must have winced when he read the final verdict of this case. Swisher has handled the details of this case in such a manner that Taney's devotion to principle and that he was no respecter of persons when principles were at stake are strikingly made vivid.

As a man, Taney is seen in these pages as he was in life, a noble character, possessed of a hot temper which he fought valiantly until he subdued it and turned its vigor into that calmness that was the marvel of his friends and the lash of his enemies. He was always a man of Christian virtue. His home life is touchingly dealt with in these pages, yet not overdone. In his dealing with the slaves which he had acquired from his people he manumitted all except those who were too aged to provide for themselves. These he ever treated kindly and with consideration. His thought for others, especially those in distress, is adequately seen in the following incidents—on one occasion he met a slave girl at the public pump endeavoring to carry two pails of water far too heavy for her. He assisted the girl and when he reached the house he told the mistress of the slave that it was her duty in the future not to overburden even a slave. On another occasion, as told by the late Cardinal Gibbons, he was "in line" for Confession. The priest coming into the church noticed him and said to the three or four slaves just ahead of him to permit the Chief Justice to go first. Taney replied, "Father, the Chief Justice is not in line, but only a Catholic

penitent and sinner like everyone else, I will stay in the place I am and wait my turn." That is truly an evidence of Taney's Catholic democracy.

L. L. McVay.

The Catholic University of America.

Chaos in Mexico. By Charles S. MacFarland. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1935. Pp. 284.)

The majority of works which concern themselves with the bitter struggle between Church and State in Mexico degenerate into propaganda for one faction or the other. Fortunately, *Chaos in Mexico* can not be accused at all of this fault. One may, in fact, declare that this book discusses the Mexican situation on a higher, more restrained, more intellectual plane than is hardly ever the case. It is a work which merits a position, along with Bishop Kelley's *Blood-Drenched Altars,* as one of the most commendable and satisfactory discussions of this question which has yet been produced.

The book represents a most sincere effort on the part of Dr. MacFarland to investigate fully and impartially the religious problems of Mexico and to present a complete and undistorted picture of the situation. At this work of investigating in Mexico the author is no beginner, for as long ago as 1922 he was engaged in the same sort of study in that country. This volume is a tribute to the earnestness with which he has devoted himself to these labors, for in these pages we see the fruits of persistent research, careful observation, much thought and sane reasoning, and effective selection and presentation of material.

Dr. MacFarland plunges into the battle between Church and State with a determination to probe to the very depths of the trouble and with no shying away from any of its phases. Practically nothing of significance escapes the scrutiny of his investigation. The case for both the Church and the State is presented in just the way which official spokesmen for each side have indicated, in interviews with the author, that it should be presented. The position of the two principals in the struggle is thoughtfully analyzed, and the reader is offered a wealth of opinions expressed by persons of almost every rank, occupation, and belief. The author frequently comments relevantly on the material given. Throughout all this no effort is made to spare anyone.

In the course of these comments Dr. MacFarland registers various charges against the Catholic Church in Mexico that can be (and many times have been) readily disproved or discredited. And yet, considering the author's attitude as a whole, we can not attribute these charges to any personal unfairness on his part, but rather to his somewhat inadequate

historical background. Indeed, even though he does occasionally make such statements which are open to successful challenge, we must not allow this to blind us to the many, and much more important, commendable features of the work. It might be said that we as Catholics owe to Dr. MacFarland a large debt of thanks for having undertaken and having completed, in a more able fashion than all Catholics except one have yet been able to do, the difficult task of presenting in full this struggle between the State and the Catholic Church in Mexico. And it must be said, too, that the reader, on finishing the book, has the distinct feeling that the Church has not come off second-best in the "baring of souls" which Dr. MacFarland carries out.

It is in his analysis of political conditions that the author is most convincing and is without doubt at his best. His close investigation into the operations of the government reveals such more or less obvious things as the fact that the present government represents a pitifully small minority, that it is inefficient, grossly corrupt, greatly confused and contradictory, that it is opportunist in nature, experimental in practice, unimpressive and frequently disgusting in personnel. His study likewise brings to light the amazing duplicity of the government, its contempt of public opinion at home but its deep concern with public opinion from abroad, the ineptness of government officials in denying that persecution of the Church does exist, the existence of unarmed and unorganized, though potentially powerful, opposition to the government throughout the country, etc.

In short, Dr. MacFarland carefully diagnoses the case of the Mexican government and discovers an alarming condition, one which arises from a great variety of causes and which may or may not prove fatal. His political acumen undoubtedly reaches its height when on several occasions (as on p. 57) he ventures the belief that Cárdenas might attempt to replace Calles as the dominant figure in the National Revolutionary Party and as dictator of the country. It is, of course, a matter now of history that late in June of 1935 Cárdenas did overthrow Calles with startling suddenness and amazing ease. Hardly anyone else, even in Mexico, would have thought of prophesying such a thing at the time when Dr. MacFarland did so in this book late last spring.

In his final summary the author does not reach any surprising conclusions. He expresses the opinion that unless the present government of Mexico accomplishes more than now seems likely, there will surely be yet another re-formation. He admits that a totalitarian state might quite easily grow out of this government. He says elsewhere, however, that it is his belief that the political situation may remain for a considerable time just about as it now is, though there is always the chance that the potentially powerful opposition may at any time become united, vocal, and dominant. He believes that the Church and the State do each other a good

deal of injustice, neither being willing to take the other at its best, and he conceives that what is needed for a settlement of the trouble is a sane and progressive government and a Church hierarchy making fewer claims but offering larger service. With these rather general opinions it is not difficult to be largely in agreement. That the author does not make many specific predictions is not to be wondered at, for the contents of the book are more than enough to convince us that that type of prediction is almost impossible to make when dealing with the confusing situation in Mexico.

Finally, it can be said that *Chaos in Mexico* is most probably as fine and as fair a work on this subject as we can ever hope to receive from the pen of a truly sincere Protestant. It is the best book available to read in conjunction with Bishop Kelley's *Blood-Drenched Altars.*

WALTER M. LANGFORD.

University of Notre Dame,
Notre Dame, Indiana.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

At the early age of 44, Dr. Parker T. Moon, president of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, 1926, and professor of international relations at Columbia University, died suddenly on June 11. Dr. Moon's chief interest, as shown by his numerous writings and lectures, was international peace. For several years he was president of the Catholic Association for International Peace. He served on the staff of the American commission at the peace conference, 1918-1919, acting as secretary of the international committee on territorial problems. Since 1921 he was editor of the *Political Science Quarterly*. He was also vice president of the Student's International Union, and secretary of the Academy of Political Science. His presidential address before the ASSOCIATION concerned the Task of the Catholic Historian. At the time of his death Professor Moon was preparing a volume on French foreign policy since the war.

The Rev. Dr. Joseph B. Code has been appointed assistant in American Church history at the Catholic University of America. Dr. Code, well-known for his promotion of the cause of Mother Seton, last year received the doctorate of historical science at Louvain University. In addition to his dissertation, *Queen Elizabeth and the English Catholic Historians*, he has published several works on Mother Seton, *Great American Foundresses*, and numerous periodical articles.

A complimentary dinner was given in Washington, D. C., June 11, to Dr. Henry E. Bourne, retiring managing editor of the *American Historical Review*, and to Doctors Dumas Malone and Harris E. Starr, editors of the *Dictionary of American Biography*. Dr. Guilday spoke on behalf of Professor Bourne.

At consistories held June 15-18, Monsignor Giovanni Mercati, prefect of the Vatican Library, and Monsignor Eugenio Tisserant, pro-prefect, were created Cardinals. Cardinal Tisserant visited the United States in 1933 to study the organization and administration of American libraries. Following his visit the Carnegie Foundation financed a mission to Rome to catalogue and index the books and manuscripts of the Vatican Library.

The first issue of the *Franco-American Review*, a quarterly devoted to history, literature, and criticism, has appeared. There is an American editorial board of eleven and a French board of ten members. The *Review* will be published by the Yale University Press, 463 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.; the subscription rate is $3.00.

As a part of the cooperative work now being done by the American Library Association and the Cooperative Cataloging Service of the Library of Congress in analyzing difficult series and sets of publications, entries will soon begin to be printed for both the Greek and the Latin series of Migne's Patrologia. The Cooperative Cataloging Service of the Library of Congress will carry along at the same time the analysis of the three principal sets of the writings of the Fathers in English. Since it is probable that numerous libraries having these sets would like to have them catalogued analytically, we are asked to call attention to this undertaking and give the estimated cost of a dictionary catalogue set of cards for each of the five series, as follows:

Migne Patrologia latina	221 vols.	$65.58
Migne Patrologia graeca	161 vols.	37.89
Ante-Nicene Christian library (Edinburgh)	24 vols.	2.82
Ante-Nicene Fathers (Buffalo)	9 vols.	4.86
Select library of Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers (New York)	28 vols.	2.64

Those interested in obtaining sets of these cards are invited to write for fuller information to the American Library Association, Cooperative Cataloging Committee, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Saint Paul, the Man and the Teacher, by Dr. Anderson Scott, is "a new character study," published by the Cambridge University Press.

Jew and Greek: Tutors unto Christ, by G. H. C. MacGregor and A. C. Purdy, is the first volume in the International Theological Library of Christian Knowledge, and treats of the Jewish and Hellenistic background of the New Testament (Nicholson and Watson).

Hugh J. Schonfield has written the *History of Jewish Christianity*, from the first to the twentieth century (Duckworth).

Two volumes on the Middle Ages appeared in French during the month of May. One of these was volume three of Charles Diehl's and George Marçais' *Histoire du Moyen Age*, entitled *Le monde oriental de 395 à 1081* (Presses Universitaires de France). The other was the second volume of the *Histoire de l'Église*, by A. M. Jacquin, O. P. This second volume, with the title *Le Haut moyen âge*, studies the period from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to the advent of Charlemagne (768). The publisher is Desclée de Brouwer.

A new edition of the late Hastings Rashdall's *Universities in the Middle Ages* has been edited, in three volumes, by F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden (Oxford, Clarendon Press; London, Milford).

The *Grosvenor Library Bulletin*, volume 18, no. 2 (December, 1935), prints a list of medieval MSS. in that library, 24 items.

The Origins of Jansenism, by Nigel Abercrombie (Oxford, Clarendon Press), is treated theologically and historically.

Dr. A. Lukyn Williams, in *Adversus Judaeos*, gives "a bird's-eye view of Christian apologiae until the Renaissance" (Cambridge University Press).

Letouzey et Ané announce the publication of parts 51 and 52 of their valuable *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques*. These parts include the entries running from "Bohier" to "Bonnecombe."

The *Catholic Encyclopedia*, the first volume of which is reviewed in the present number of the REVIEW, also appears in the Shahan Memorial edition, sponsored by the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae, of which Bishop Shahan was honorary president from its formation until his death. The distinguishing features of this de luxe edition are its frontispiece portrait, its binding, and the end papers illustrating the career and achievements of the rector of the Catholic University.

Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu (January-June), opens with an important critical discussion of the historical and psychological factors in the conversion of St. Ignatius Loyola. New and striking parallels to Ignatian ideology and phraseology have been found in contemporary chronicles and songs, in the Spanish translation of the *Flos Sanctorum*, in a Cistercian prologue to the *Legenda Aurea*, and in particular traits of the spirituality of St. Francis, St. Dominic and St. Onophrius. Emphasis is laid on the current of Catholic restoration which had begun to flow in Spain, and on "una fuerza psicológica de introspección del todo moderna, tan fina en el análisis como personal y fecunda en la orientación integral y dinámica de la vide." This new interpretation of *El capitán Iñigo López de Loyola en su patria y época* will be set forth and documented in a work shortly to be published by P. Pedro Leturia, S. J., dean of the faculty of ecclesiastical history in the Gregorian University. An article in English by Fr. W. C. Repetti, of Manila Observatory, deals with St. Francis Xavier in Maluco, and makes it clear that the visit to Mindanao is without historical foundation. New light on the heroic part played by the Jesuits of Parma during the plague of 1630 is set forth in an article by P. Giuseppe Castellani. P. Fría edits three letters of Philip II which illustrate the king's interest in the work of the Society in France. Very interesting to American readers will be a note by P. Pietro Tacchi Venturi "Per la biografia del P. Gianmaria Salvaterra: Tre nuove lettere." The letters in question are those in which the young Salvaterra, in 1670, 1671 and 1672, tells the General of the Society of his longing to work in the American missions. In a short communication "Notas críticas sobre la Dama del capitán Loyola," P. Pedro Leturia proposes the view that

neither Germaine de Foix nor Eleanor of Austria was the Lady of Iñgo's early dreams but rather Catherine, the younger sister of Charles V. Father Peter M. Dunne of San Francisco contributes a brief study of an unpublished apologetic of the Jesuit missionaries of Sinaloa, "Apologetico defensorio y puntual manifiesto," written by P. F. X. de Faría in 1657, and preserved in the national archives in Mexico City. P. Frías deals with "La profesión del duque de Gandía," examining current views in the light of the sources. Among the reviews of books two American works will be noticed: *The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana* by Dr. Jean Delanglez, and *Chapters in Frontier History* by Dr. Gilbert J. Garraghan. P. Lamalle continues his general bibliography of recent works dealing with the history of the Society of Jesus. (G. G. W.)

Church History for March contains articles on: Asceticism *versus* Militarism in the Middle Ages, by John T. McNeill; the Synod of Michigan and Movements for Social Reform, 1834-1869, by L. G. Vander Velde; and Church and State in Italy during the Last Years of Pius IX, by S. William Halperin. In the June issue James Moffatt writes on Miles Coverdale; E. R. Adair on Laud and the Church of England; Roland H. Bainton on Servetus and the Genevan Libertines; Leon Arpee on a Century of Armenian Protestantism; and R. Pierce Beaver on the Organization of the Church of Africa on the Eve of the Vandal Invasion.

The *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia* (Barcelona, Biblioteca Balmes, vol. XI, 1936) contains a "Bibliografia Hispànica de Ciencies Històrico-Ecclesiàstiques" (pp. 152), compiled by the Director of the Balmes Library, Rev. Dr. Josep Vives, with the collaboration of Professor Lewis Hanke of Harvard University, Rev. Dr. Joseph Rius Serra of Rome, and Jeanne Vielliard, archivist of the National Archives of Paris. The bibliography covers the publications of the year 1934.

Miscellanea Isidoriana: Homenaje a San Isidoro de Sevilla en el xiii centenario de su muerte, 636-1936, is just off the press (Pont. Università Gregoriana, Rome). The sixteen articles deal authoritatively with many aspects of Isidore's life, work and influence, such as the present state of Isidorean research (Altaner), general appreciation (Garcia Villada), chronology of the writings (de Aldama), Biblical interests (Zarb and Ogara), liturgical work (Morin and Séjourné), canon law (Bigador), missions (Zeiller), education (Elorduy), influence from seventh to ninth century (Anspach). There is an article on the 18th century editor of Isidore's works, Faustino Arévalo, S. J. An article of fundamental paleographical importance is contributed by P. Silva-Tarouca, of the faculty of ecclesiastical history of the Gregorian University. It is shown that *Vat. Ottobon. lat.* 93 (dated by Hinschius c. 1100) is in reality as old as the pseudo-Isidorean decretals, and may be dated about 850. (G. G. W.)

A short life of *St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, by C. F. Andrews, will shortly appear from Hodder and Stoughton.

New light upon the education of women and religious sentiment in the France of the *ancien régime* is to be found in a volume by Anne Bertout. It is entitled *Les Ursulines de Paris sous l'ancien régime*, and is a rather complete history of the two great Parisian convents of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The publisher is Beauchesne, Paris.

Another study of interest to students of the religious life is Jean Monval's *Les Frères hospitaliers de Saint Jean de Dieu*. It is a recent addition to the collection "Grands Ordres Monastiques" (B. Grasset).

Genève et la révocation de l'Edit de Nantes, by P. Bertrand, is one of the latest publications of the Librarie Fischbacher.

Valuable source material for the religious history of France is to be found in Msgr. J. M. Vidal's recent publication, *Documents sur M. de Caulet, Évêque de Pamiers, et sur le schisme de la régale dans ce diocèse* (A. Picard).

French hagiographical studies continue to pour from the presses. Among the recent publications, we may mention *Le père Edouard Epinette* (Dillen), by Abbé Paul Commanche; *La mère Alix Le Clerc première religieuse de la Congrégation Notre Dame, 1576-1622* (J. de Gigord), by Edmond Renard; Louis Leclève's story of the Franciscan mystic, *Sainte Angèle de Foligno. Sa vie, ses oeuvres* (Plon); and finally, still another book on St. Joan of Arc, *La Pucelle d'Orléans* (Mercure de France), by Jean Jacoby.

Guy de Valous is the author of a pretentious and valuable addition to the "Archives de la France Monastique." Volumes 39, 40, 41 of that collection are his *Le monarchisme clunisien des origines au XV^e siècle*. In the one thousand pages of his study, M. de Valous has included a complete description of the internal life and organization of the Order of Cluny and of its monasteries. The first volume is devoted to the Abbey of Cluny and the monasteries affiliated with it. The second volume is entitled "L'Ordre de Cluny," and the third volume deals with the temporalities, particualrly with the financial situation of the Cluisian establishments between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries. The publisher is A. Picard, Paris.

Articles in the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* for April: "Faux et fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne" (concluded), by Gustave Bardy; "Les grâces expectatives sous le règne de Phillipe VI de Valois," by G. Mollat; and "La conversion de saint Vincent de Paul," by Pierre Debongnie. The notes concern: "L'authenticité d'un des nouveaux

sermons de S. Augustin, confirmée par le concile de Séville de 619," by J. Madoz, S. J.; "Un discours pretendument inédit de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie sur l'Ascension," by Ch. Martin, S. J.; "Une secte d'herétiques à Médina del Campo en 1459," by Mario Esposito; and "Un Jésuite anglais aux Pays-Bas espagnols: Sir Edward Stanley (1564-1639)," by Louis Antheunis.

The direction of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* announces that the new edition of Gregory of Tours' *History of the Franks*, by the veteran scholar Bruno Krusch, is nearing completion. Up to now the edition by W. Arndy in the *Monumenta* has been the best available, but it was by no means definite. The new edition will be warmly welcomed and will, it is hoped, form a fitting crown to Krusch's vast editorial labors.

It has been observed that in recent years the series *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum* has been too elaborately and ambitiously edited. The editions scarcely differ from the new *Scriptores* series of the *Monumenta* with which they agree in format. It has been wisely decided to return to the original idea of simple school editions. The volumes will be cheaper and much easier to produce. They will aid in solving the problems of securing suitable class texts. (A. K. Z.)

Dr. Hans Rost, editor of the oldest German newspaper, has published three annuals for bibliographiles, which he inscribed to the memory of St. Wiborada, an anchoress (d. 928) who became famous for saving books from the Huns: *Sankt Wiborada, Ein Jahrbuch fuer Buecherfreunde*, 3 vols. The first two volumes contain treatises on costly books and libraries of the Middle Ages and bibliophiles of modern times, foremost on Cardinal Ehrle. The third volume offers contributions to artistic bookbinding, ex-libris, medieval libraries, and a valuable treatise on curses of thieves of books. Pope Pius XI is ably described by his successor as librarian at the Ambrosiana and great bibliophile. Every volume gives reviews of the latest literature on bibliophilia. The makeup of the volumes answers the most severe tests of artistic bookmaking as to the quality of paper. composition of type and sumptuous illustrations. The price, about three dollars, is very moderate for a quarto of 200 pages. The editor is also the publisher. (J. M. L.)

Pierre de Montesquiou-Fezensac is the author of a short but worthwhile book on recent papal history. It is entitled *Rapports de la Papauté avec le Royaume d'Italie depuis 1870* (Sirey).

Catholicism in England, 1535-1935, by David Mathew, is described as a "portrait of a minority, its culture and tradition" (Longmans).

The *Life of Bishop Challoner* (*1691-1781*), by Michael Trappes-Lomas,

is an adaptation from Dr. Edwin Burton's biography, long out of print (Longmans).

Sketches of ten Fellows who contributed to the Oxford Movement are collected by R. D. Middleton in his recent volume, *Magdalen Studies* (S. P. C. K.).

Reference to the Church in Dr. L. Elliott Binns' *Religion in the Victorian Era* (Lutterworth Press) is rather to its contact with the Church of England than to its own position.

Sheed and Ward will publish in September G. K. Chesterton's *Autobiography*, which fortunately was completed before the author's death; and Hilaire Belloc's *Reformation Portraits*.

The *Chronicle of Melrose*, from the Cottonian MS., Faustina B. IX, in the British Museum, has been reproduced in collotype, with an introduction by Alan O. and Marjorie O. Anderson (Humphries).

The Register of John Swayne, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, 1418-1419, with some entries of earlier and later archbishops, has been edited by D. A. Chart (Belfast, H. M. Stationery Office).

Historical articles in the March number of *Studies*: "An Irish Crusader for American Democracy: Matthew Lyon, 1750-1822," by Richard J. Purcell; "Richard FitzRalph, Archbishop of Armagh," VI, by Aubrey Gwynn, S. J.; "Uganda Calls to Ireland," by V. M. Crawford; "The Dublin Newspaper Press, 1659-1916," by Stephen J. Brown, S. J.; and "Salazar and the New State of Portugal," by Thomas J. O'Donnell, S. J. In the June issue will be found an appreciation of Dr. Callan of Maynooth, by P. J. McLaughlin; and a statement on the Present Position of Catholics in Germany, by an anonymous "observer."

The third annual meeting of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association was held at Quebec, May 12-13. Joint sessions of the two sections of the Association included an evening assembly at Laval University and two luncheon conferences and a dinner at the Chateau Frontenac. The first session, over which the Very Rev. Olivier Maurault, P. S. S., Rector of the University of Montreal and President General of the Association, presided, was attended by a large audience including archbishops, bishops, and heads of religious institutions and communities. Addresses were given by the Rev. Edward Kelly, president of the English section, on Quebec and Upper Canada under the Old Régime; and by Cardinal Villeneuve, Archbishop of Quebec and Honorary President of the Association, on the work and aims of the association. His Eminence called

attention to the supernatural element in the association's task, and indicated its duty to contribute to the accumulation of evidence which may lead to the canonization of Canadian servants of God. The luncheon conferences had as their respective topics, Ecclesiastical Biography and Parish History. At the annual dinner the Very Rev. Olivier Maurault read his presidential address; and addresses were given by Mayor Grégoire of Quebec and the Rev. Dr. Alexandré Vachon of Laval University. In the absence of Sir Arthur Doughty, Dr. James F. Kenney, former president of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, gave a brief talk on Early Catholic Printing in Canada, based on notes prepared by the late J. J. Murphy. At the English Section the following papers were read: Robert Cannon, K. C., "Edward Cannon, 1739-1814"; the Rev. A. A. Johnston, "The Right Rev. William Fraser, First Bishop of Halifax and of Arichat"; P. F. Cronin, "Early Catholic Journalism in Canada"; the Rev. J. A. Gallagher, C. SS. R., "The Irish Emigration of 1847 and its Canadian Consequences"; Brother Memorian, F. S. C., "The Work of Bishop Grandin in the West." Before the French Section: The Rev. Georges Robitaille, "Marie de l'Incarnation d'après sa correspondance"; Miss Marie C. Daveluy, "Les Dames de la Société de Notre-Dame de Montreal"; Gustave Lanctôt, K. C., "M. de la Valinière, 1732-1806"; the Rev. Pascal Poyvin, "L'aumônier des insurgés de 1837"; the Rev. Thomas M. Charland, O. P., "L'oeuvre historique de l'abbé Louis-Edouard Bois"; the Rev. Albert Gravel, "Bethléem, établissement monastique à la Patrie en 1880"; and the Rev. Luc Morin, "Le Séminaire de Chicoutimi."

The Rev. Edward Kelly was elected President General for the coming year; the Rev. J. B. O'Reilly, president of the English Section; and Pierre Georges Roy, president of the French Section. Announcement was made of an endowment of over $500, to provide for the issue of medals in honor of George Edward Clerk (1815-1875), first editor of the Montreal *True Witness*. (J. F. K.)

Among the manuscripts in McGill University Library, listed in the June number of the *Canadian Historical Review*, are papers relating to the Roman Catholic Church and Church property in Lower Canada, 1789-1840, approximately 150 pp., comprising letters, petitions, legal opinions, etc., referring to the Jesuit estates, clergy reserves, etc.

At India's first Catholic Summer School, organized by the All-India Catholic League and held at Mangalore, May 17-31, a series of ten lectures was given by Prof. C. J. Varkey on Landmarks in the History of the Church.

The first annual *Report* of Dr. R. D. W. Connor, U. S. national archivist, reviews the problem of the national archives since 1774; describes, with

illustrations, the new building; and presents an outline of the organization and personnel of the various divisions.

A program for the formal inauguration of the Institute of Jesuit History of Loyola University, Chicago, was given in two sessions on June 11. Reverend Samuel K. Wilson, S. J., President of Loyola University, announced the opening of the Institute and after appointing the officers, mentioned telegrams and letters of felicitation from various universities and scholars of the country. Jerome V. Jacobson, S. J., the director, then addressed the assembly on the organization of the project. The purpose of the group of workers will be to investigate sources of American history wherein the Jesuits have had part, to collect, organize, and publish works from and including these sources, and to make the archives and members available to scholars and graduate students. The speaker explained the origin of the idea and the constitutions of the Institute. W. Eugene Shiels, S. J., the assistant director and archivist, accounted for the method and scope of the organization. Beginning with the archival materials in the Mississippi Valley and its approaches, an attempt will be made to photofilm documents along lines similar to those of the National Archives at Washington. Dr. Herbert E. Bolton entitled his address "The Jesuits in America: An Opportunity for Historians." He enumerated in considerable detail the many repositories of Jesuit manuscripts and indicated particular phases and episodes of Spanish colonial mission history which have thus far remained uninvestigated, illustrating his remarks with references to newly-discovered documents pertaining to the earlier West Coast history, and suggesting investigation possibilities to the new Institute. Dr. Bolton presided at the evening session during which Raymond Corrigan, S. J., read "The Missions of New France: A Study in Motivation," Gilbert J. Garraghan, S. J., surveyed "A Westward Movement of the Jesuits," and Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick offered "A Challenge to the Institute." The first of the papers presented a viewpoint which has been repeatedly missed by writers in English on the mission history of New France. Father Garraghan began his survey of the Jesuit advance across the continent at White Marsh, Maryland, and ended it in Santa Clara, California, and thus offered another line for research. Dr. Fitzpatrick presented a number of projects for research from the viewpoint of the educator, namely, an educational history of the Jesuits, a detailed treatment of the missionary as educator, regional planner, and civilizer, a history of the influence of the *Spiritual Exercises* as an educational force, and others. The papers are to appear in *Mid-America*. (J. V. J.)

Vol. III, no. 2, of the *Preliminary Studies of the Texas Catholic Historical Society*, distributed under the auspices of the Texas Knights of

Columbus Historical Commission, contains several documents on *La Salle's Occupation of Texas*, translated by Walter J. O'Donnell, C. S. C.; no. 3 of the same volume is a study of *Coronado, Oñate, and Quivira*, by David Donoghue. Both are reprints from *Mid-America*.

Search for further documentary descriptions of Mission Espiritu Santo at Goliad is being made by the National Park Service. Collections in the libraries of Texas and California have been consulted, and additional research in Mexico is to be undertaken. Some of the foundations of the mission have been unearthed, and artifacts are constantly being found which reveal much about life in the mission. Restoration of the mission has been undertaken in connection with the cooperative development of the Goliad State Park by the National Park Service and the Texas State Parks Board.

A series of articles, by Alexander M. Stewart, on Early Voyageur Priests, appeared in the *Catholic Coureur*, New York, during November.

The tercentenary of the founding of Maryland in 1634 has stimulated the publication of various books having connection with that historic event. Among others, one has been sent for review, *Register of Maryland's Heraldic Families*, by Alice Norris Parran, President of the Southern Maryland Society of Colonial Dames. It is a record of the manor grants of Colonial Maryland from 1634, with the families who inherited these manors, and the addition in many cases of a page illustration of the coat-of-arms, with genealogical and traditional details. These coats-of-arms, so clearly and well represented by Mrs. Parran, were brought over with other valued possessions by that little band of "Gentlemen Adventurers" and their followers to a savage and uninhabited country, where they hoped to reproduce, as far as could be, the country life of their beloved land, with the addition of the religious liberty which all, in that early settlement, Catholics and Protestants alike so ardently desired. The *Register* represents a very large amount of research in a difficult field. Mrs. Parran is to be congratulated on preserving many traditions of a civilization, unique of its kind, which united so many of the best elements of the England of that day with the seeds of a vision of American democracy.

Early in March the *Louisville Record* issued a special illustrated supplement, the theme of which was "One Hundred and Fifty Years of Catholicity in Kentucky."

With a pertinent Foreword on its value by His Excellency, the Most Rev. Francis J. Johannes, D. D., Bishop of Leavenworth, Father George Towle has published an interesting centenary brochure on the history of his parish—*Kickapoo, Kansas: A Century Old* (Leavenworth, 1936, pp.

34). It was at Kickapoo that the valiant misisonary Father Charles van Quickenborne, S. J., erected in 1836 the first Catholic church in Kansas.

His Excellency, the Most Rev. Thomas K. Gorman, D. D., D. Sc. Hist. (Louvain), Bishop of Reno, has recently published a diamond jubilee brochure on *Seventy-Five Years of Catholic Life in Nevada: 1860-1935.* The new Diocese of Reno (1931) has had an interesting history. It once formed part of the jurisdiction of Archbishop Alemany of San Francisco, became part of the diocese of Grass Valley (Sacramento) and part of the diocese of Salt Lake. Some historic old towns are described in the book—Virginia City, Divide, Carson City, Les Vegas, and Reno.

The four numbers of Vol. XLV of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* have been issued simultaneously. The March (1935) number contains papers on James Alphonsus McMaster, Pioneer Catholic Journalist of the United States, by Sr. M. M. Mildred, S. H. C. J.; and on Secretary of Legation Meyer, first secretary of the French legation in the U. S., by Dr. John J. Meng. The June issue prints articles on Jesuits Relinquish Selma, Ala., by J. J. McCarthy, S. J.; Preliminaries of French Secret Aid, 1775-1778, by Dr. Elizabeth S. Kite; and the Political Philosophy of William Penn, by Dr. J. J. Meng. The September number is devoted entirely to "The Greater Glory," a pageant of the English martyrs, by Sr. Mary Donatius, I. H. M. In the December number Ella M. E. Flick writes on Bishop Horstmann; and Edward F. Goss, S. J., on the Taft Commission to the Vatican, 1902. The March, 1936, issue contains a study of Nativism in Pennsylvania, with particular regard to its Effect on Politics and Education, 1840-1860, by Sr. M. St. Henry; and the seventh part of Father Francis E. Tourscher's history of Old St. Augustine's in Philadelphia.

Vol. XXVI of the *Historical Records and Studies* of the United States Catholic Historical Society is rich in content. T. J. Reardon given an account of St. Peter's Sesquicentennial Celebration; Ignatius L. Ryan, C. P., from materials drawn largely from the Pickett Papers in the Library of Congress, presents the hitherto little known story of the Confederate Agents in Ireland; the Rev. Laurence J. Kenny, S. J., gives some interesting information respecting Father John Bannon, one of the agents treated in Father Ryan's study; Cuthbert E. Allen, O. S. B., writes on the Slavery Question in Catholic Newspapers, 1850-1865; and the venerable editor, Mr. Thomas F. Meehan, throws new light on Giovanni Battista Sartori, the first consul to represent the United States at the papal court. Sartori's correspondence with the Department of State will be printed in the forthcoming second volume of the ASSOCIATION'S *Documents.*

The *Historical Bulletin* for May includes part I of Father Laurence K. Patterson's essay on the Religion of Napoleon; part II of Father Henry W. Casper's account of Church and State in the Middle Ages; the second instalment of Father Charles E. Schrader's picture of the World in which Dante Lived; and Ethel O'Merrill's Panorama of History in Romance.

The Catholic Association for International Peace has published as Pamphlet No. 21, *An Introduction to Mexico*, by Anna Dill Gamble and the Rev. R. A. McGowan (pp. 48).

Documents: Instructions for Parish Priests [from John Mirk's *Festiall*, 15th century], contributed by Karl Young (*Speculum*, April); Petition relating to the Bull, *Ad Fructus Uberes*, and the Opposition of the French Secular Clergy in 1282, Gaines Post (*ibid.*); the Terms of the Interdict of Innocent III, T. M. Parker (*ibid.*); Tres cartas de Felipe II, recomendando la compañia a los Reyes chistianísimos (1565-1567), Lesmes Frías, S. J. (*Archivium Historicum Societatis Jesu*, January-June); Per la Biografia del P. Gianmaria Salvaterra: tre nuove lettere, Pietro Tracchi-Venturi (*ibid.*).

Anniversaries: 25th: Catholic Press Association; diocese of Toledo; St. Sebastian's, Milwaukee, Wis. (*Catholic Herald Citizen*, Apr. 25); St. Paul's, San Francisco, Calif. *50th*: Archdiocese of Ottawa; St. Peter Claver's, Philadelphia (*Catholic Standard and Times*, June 5); St. Mary, Star of the Sea, Branchdale, Pa.; St. Ambrose's, Ironwood, Wis.; St. Mary's, Hurley, Wis.; St. Rose's, Racine, Wis. *75th*: Loretto Academy, Niagara Falls, Ont.; Holy Redeemer, Perry, Wis.; St. Mary's, Durand, Wis.; St. Mary's, High Hill, Tex. (*Southern Messenger*, June 4). *100th*: Founding of the Ancient Order of Hibernians; founding of the Marist Fathers; SS. Peter and Paul, Beaver, Pa. (*Pittsburgh Catholic*, May 7); St. Gabriel's, Prairie du Chien, Wis.; first Catholic Church in Kansas (at Kickapoo); diocese of Corpus Christi, Tex. (*Southern Messenger*, Mar. 26). *500th*: Basilica of Santa Maria del Fiore, Florence, Italy.

BRIEF NOTICES

AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY, *Proceedings.* Vol. 44, n. s., Pt. 2 (Worcester, Mass., the Society, 1935, pp. 189-408.) In addition to the proceedings of the annual meeting held October 17, 1934, the following papers are printed: "The Maryland Muse by Ebenezer Cooke," a facsimile with an introduction by Lawrence C. Wroth; "The Libraries of the Presidents of the United States," by A. S. W. Rosenbach; and "Daniel Hewett's List of Newspapers and Periodicals in the United States in 1828."

ATWATER, DONALD, *The Catholic Church in Modern Wales.* (London, Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 1935, pp. xiii, 235.) This is an appealing penpicture of one of the countless facets of the mystical Body of Jesus Christ—that one which glows and functions in Wales. In the fifteen chapters making up this volume Donald Atwater has gathered and thus preserved much that is of value to the Church historians of the future. The part played in the preservation of the faith and its spread by the children of such families as the Powels, Havards, Morgans, Metcalfs, Mostyns, James, Vaughans, and Herberts is especially well done. The last chapter on the conversion of the rest of the Welshmen is, to say the least, thought provoking. (L. L. MCVAY.)

BARROIS, A. G., O. P., *Précis d'archéologie biblique.* (Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1935, pp. 202.) This little summary of Biblical Archaeology is serial Number 75 of the *Bibliothèque Catholique des Sciences Religieuses.* In the short space of 200 pages, P. Barrois has condensed what he considers the latest and best grounded conclusions in the field of Archaeology. We say "conclusions" because it is not the plan of the author to enter into a discussion of the material; he refers to several articles for a more lengthy and thorough treatment of the problems. The archaeological data are constantly brought into relation with the Bible, which itself is one of our most precious sources of information. One feels that the author is thoroughly conversant with his subject, having himself been actively engaged on the field of excavation. Some of his assertions may seem startling at first sight as *e. g.* his view on the Rephaim (p. 10), but we feel that he is sure of his ground. The little volume is compact, comprehensive, reliable and very clear. It will form an admirable guide for the student who wishes to work out the problems in detail. We regret that the general plan of the collection and the special purpose of the author would not allow a more detailed bibliography on the various points, although the essential is given; anyone who will refer to the treatment of the problems as pointed out, will there find fuller references to help him in his work. We recommend the work not only to the cultured layman for whom it was primarily written, but also to all our ecclesiastical students. (R. BUTIN, S. M.)

BEMIS, SAMUEL FLAGG, *The Diplomacy of the American Revolution.* Part I: *The Foundations of American Diplomacy, 1775-1823.* [The American Historical Association.] (New York, London, D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935, pp. xiii, 293, $3.50.) It has remained for Professor Bemis to supply the first condensed comprehensive account of the diplomacy of the American Revolution. The result of his labors is admirable. His volume, which is thoroughly documented and supplied with maps, bibliography and index, outlines the history of America's first foreign contacts, culminating in the peace settlement of 1783. These contacts were primarily with France, and in the beginning were informal and secret. The channel through which French secret aid reached the United States was the commercial firm of Roderigue Hortalez et Cie., which Dr. Bemis erroneously calls "fictitious" (p. 37). There has been much discussion as to whether the supplies furnished by Hortalez et Cie. were intended as a free gift by the French Government, or whether they were to be paid for by the Americans. Dr. Bemis adopts the former thesis, and bases his contention largely upon certain informal discussions in London in May, 1776, between Arthur Lee and Caron de Beaumarchais, later head of the house of Hortalez. At this time the French Government had made no commitments of any kind with regard to the Americans. There is every reason to believe that Beaumarchais acted solely on his own initiative. Dr. Bemis admits that we do not know "just what assurances Beaumarchais gave Lee" (p. 35). But it made little difference what these assurances were; Beaumarchais had no authority to make any. At this period he was simply proposing to Lee a scheme that he hoped his government would adopt. There is no evidence to show that when the government did begin sending secret aid to America it intended that aid to be a free gift. In the last days of 1775, when the French Foreign Minister first suggested secret aid to the cabinet of Louis XVI, his plan called for repayment by the Americans for any supplies received, and this attitude was consistently adhered to by the government from that date forward. The subsidies that Beaumarchais received from the governments of France and Spain were delivered to him with the injunction that "you will give us an account of your profits and your losses and we will decide whether we should accord you new subsidies or cease to hold you responsible for the sums previously accorded you" (Lomenie, *Beaumarchais*, II, 293 *seq.*).

The later developments of European diplomacy with regard to America are outlined in masterly fashion, although the assertion that Vergennes was willing "to accept terms which would have tricked the United States out of its independence" (p. 187) seems gratuitous when placed beside Article VIII of the Franco-American treaty of alliance. Vergennes' idea to which Dr. Bemis refers was that the war might be ended by a truce, during which mediatory powers might guarantee the existence of peace. The terms of the treaty of alliance would have been satisfied by a *tacit* assurance of the independence of the United States as much as by the formal assurance which was eventually forthcoming. The five final chapters, dealing with the peace negotiations of 1782-83, give the most complete and accurate account yet made available to students of this crucial period in the history of indepen-

dence. They are in themselves sufficient to make Dr. Bemis' work a standard book of reference on the subject. (JOHN J. MENG.)

BEMIS, SAMUEL FLAGG, and GRIFFIN, GRACE GARDNER, *Guide to the Diplomatic History of the United States: 1775-1921.* (Washington, D. C., United States Government Printing Office, 1935, pp. xvii, 979, $3.50.) There are two main divisions to this extraordinarily well constructed work. The organization of the volume is simple. Under a topical and chronological arrangement, the references to the sources are intended "to direct and assist the general student by revealing what has been written on the subjects outlined . . . to indicate the printed sources and how to get at them . . . to give at least, and merely, suggestions for further sources in manuscript and archival collections, as well as for the study of pertinent maps. . . ." Part I contains twenty-two chapters covering the period of American diplomacy from the Revolution to the Peace Settlement of 1918-1921. It is gratifying to note that the studies of three members of the faculty of the Catholic University of America are cited—those by Dr. Leo F. Stock, Dr. John J. Meng, and Dr. Herbert F. Wright. The twenty-third and last chapter of Part I (*General Works, Historical Publications and Aids,* pp. 680-787) is invaluable for all students of American history. It warrants being reproduced as an off-print to supplement Professor Hockett's *Introduction.* Part II (*Remarks on the Sources,* pp. 788-942) has for its purpose "to guide the investigator in the sources for the diplomatic history of United States." It contains three chapters on the nature of the sources, on printed state reports, and on archival collections here and abroad. The student who comes fresh to the subject might profitably begin with Part II, then thoroughly master chapter twenty-three and then take up the study of Part I. The value of this truly great work of scholarship goes far beyond the limitations of its title. It places Professor Bemis in the front rank of historians of modern diplomacy and it adds fresh laurels to the fame of Miss Grace Gardner Griffin. (P. G.)

BUELL, RAYMOND LESLIE (Ed.), *Democratic Governments in Europe.* (New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1935, pp. viii, 597, $2.50.) Three authors have contributed to make this book a timely description and analysis of the leading democracies of Europe. The major portion deals with responsible government in England and France. Eugene P. Chase has written the section on England, Robert Valeur, that on France. A chapter by the editor is devoted to the commission form of government current in Switzerland. Together they form an instructive study in comparative democracy. (JOHN J. MENG.)

COBBAN, J. M., *Senate and Provinces: 78-49 B. C. Some aspects of the foreign policy and provincial relations of the Senate during the closing years of the Roman Republic.* (Cambridge, At The University Press; New York, The Macmillan Company, 1935, pp. 218, $3.00.) Selecting as a time range that interesting period of Roman history (78-49 B. C.), in which important constitutional problems were worked out amid the stirring intrigues of the triumvirs, J. Macdonald Cobban, assistant Master at King Edward VI School, Southampton, presents in a careful essay the relation of the Roman Senate

to provinces and dependencies during the closing years of the Republic. While the author admits the difficulty of determining the precise effect of commercial motives on the foreign policy of the Senate, he takes a firm stand in *via media* and adduces convincing evidence that, on the one hand, nineteenth-century historians have overstressed the economic aspect and on the other, a well-known contemporary authority, Tenney Frank, has reacted to the other extreme (pp. 42 ff.). The above is only one of the many instances of independence of thought which entitles this compact study of the Sullan regime to recognition. The fact that it has received the coveted Thirlwall Prize (1935) awarded for original historical research marks it with the seal of scholarship. (S. A. G.)

CODE, REV. JOSEPH B. (Ed.), *Letters of Mother Seton to Mrs. Julianna Scott.* (Emmitsburg, Md., 1935, pp. x, 463.) This valuable addition to a growing Setoniana is the first in a projected series of volumes that will make more readily accessible to students and those interested in Mother Seton the writings of this great American woman. The present volume, as the title indicates, gives the remarkable story of Mother Seton's dealings with Julianna Sitgreaves Scott who, with but one other of Mother Seton's Protestant friends, remained true to her during the trials that attended her conversion to Catholicism and her establishment of the American Sisters of Charity. As Father Code says in his foreword, these letters constitute a valuable index to Mother Seton's character, disclosing it from an angle altogether different from that hitherto taken by any of her biographers. The first letter is dated April 16, 1798, and the last July 19, 1820, less than six months before she died. In view of the fact that Rome has recently approved Mother Seton's writings as a step in the process for her canonization, this volume takes on an added significance. It is hoped that her other letters, those to her children and to the early American bishops and priests especially, will soon be added to this collection, valuable both from a spiritual and an historical standpoint. (P. G.)

DUBOIS, W. E. BURGHARDT, Ph. D., *Black Reconstruction.* (New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1935, pp. 746, $4.50.) Practically all books on the Reconstruction period are partisan; perhaps because heretofore all such books have been written by white authors. "One fact alone explains the attitude of most recent writers towards Reconstruction; they cannot conceive Negroes as men; in their mind the word 'Negro' connotes 'inferiority' and 'stupidity' lightened only by unreasoning gayety and humor. . . . In propaganda against the Negro since the emancipation in this land, we face one of the most stupendous efforts the world ever saw to discredit human beings, an effort involving universities, history, science, social uplift and religion" (pp. 726, 727).

Dr. DuBois is the first Negro to author the Reconstruction. He has struck out against crushing cruelty by a fascinating defence of his own. Through 17 chapters he views the "birth of a nation" as a class struggle between capital and labor, landed and landless, more than as a race issue. His pen is brilliant, his mind sharp, and his years advanced. Yet, he has failed to write *the* history of the Reconstruction. He is brilliant but bitter; he is sharp

but cutting; he is aged but not dispassionate. It is understandable that he should be so, for he is pleading for his people against terrific odds; pleading for a rewriting of the Reconstruction period on the basis that "the Negro in America and in general is an average and ordinary human being, who under given environment develops like other human beings." Perhaps the author would have succeeded better in his task had he not started out with a thesis, Marxism, using a period of American history as his material. Knowing the author's present predilection for the philosophy of Marx (for he has publicly admitted that he is seeking a solution of the Negro's problems in the writings of Marx), one would not be surprised to find it occasionally coloring his works, but one is not quite prepared to accept his Marxist interpretation of the Negro's rôle in the great American upheaval. When Dr. Dubois speaks of the defection of thousands of slaves from their plantations to the Union side as a general strike of labor; when he uses such terminology as "the black worker," "the white worker," the "proletariat," "revolution," etc., he is employing terminology which today has a connotation not at all suitable for interpreting historical facts in this country six or seven decades ago. Economic emancipation in those days was universally predicated upon an opportunity of labor to become capital. The author has fallen into the snare of his white predecessors: he starts out with a pre-determined conclusion and fits facts into his thesis. The book is copiously supplied with excerpts, one-third of its over 700 pages being direct quotations—at times tiringly so. Unfortunately, the author does not present many new facts, nor are his authorities primary, at least not in most cases. Some of his conclusions are obviously biased, and several generalizations may be disputed. Nevertheless, *Black Reconstruction* is a move in the right direction in that it gives the historian a new interpretation which, with the books already available on that subject, will enable him to get somewhere near the truth. America is still too near those tragic years to see the facts objectively. Even those historians who are most nearly objective as regards the facts, are unconsciously biased in their interpretations of the facts by a persistent propaganda which has fashioned our national thought patterns on the Negro question. (JOHN GILLARD, S. S. J.)

DUNAWAY, WAYLAND FULLER, Ph. D., *A History of Pennsylvania*. (New York, Prentice Hall, 1935, pp. xxiii, 828, $5.00.) Pennsylvanians have long awaited a comprehensive history of their state. When one stops to consider the complicated racial influences, each with its own cultural contributions; the many ramifications of industrial and agricultural life; the mines, the forests, and the oil lands, one realizes that the task of setting down the history of the commonwealth is a gigantic one. Pennsylvania with its many local historians has been most articulate about itself—each group, each community vying for historical honors. Now, however, we have a book that should meet with approbation from all sections of Pennsylvania and from all Pennsylvania historians alike. Dr. Wayland Dunaway in *A History of Pennsylvania* has given us a text of rare merit. He has presented the development of the state through its political, industrial, cultural, social, and religious growth. He has filled his pages with succinct facts. He has amplified his work with a generous

bibliography for each chapter. This work not only gives the reader a body of sound material easily digested, but also stimulates the real historian to further investigation. Behind all the facts presented, the man who knows his Pennsylvania can, with little effort and adventure, discover the quintessence of the spirit that has made the commonwealth what it is. The manifestation of this spirit in the arts, especially in the Colonial Revolutionary period, is of great interest to the student of American literature. The bibliographies pertaining thereto are of manifest importance. But above all, the book, in method and material, is a boon to the teacher of history. (ARTHUR DEERING.)

EINSTEIN, LEWIS, *The Italian Renaissance in England.* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1935, pp. xvii, 420, $3.50.) This handbook was first published in 1902 and the student of comparative literature should welcome the reëdition with its handsome prints, including several Holbeins in sepia, which are a delight to the eye. Studies of this kind are sometimes distressingly catalogued but Dr. Einstein's prose is supple and colorful. He approaches his subject with fascinating chapter heading: *The Scholar, The Courtier, The Traveller, The Italian Merchant in England,* etc. Humanists and churchmen, Florentines and Oxonians become more than mere names. Duke Humphrey of Gloucester emerges from the tangle of the War of the Roses as the first princely patron of the new learning in England. It is remarkable that the avidity with which Englishmen sought after Italian culture did not extend until much later to the fine arts. The author is happier in passages on the Italians in England and on Petrarch's influence on English poetry than in discussions on Scholasticism *versus* Humanism. An almost imperceptible vein of antagoinsm towards medieval scholarship mars the urbanity of Dr. Einstein's thought. For example, we more than question St. Thomas More's rejection of Thomism as a valuable preparation for life. On the other hand the last chapter, on *English Catholics in Rome,* should be a spur to Catholics for further investigations in this enthralling field. Dr. Einstein tells us with a touch of humor that Sir Tobie Matthew, Bacon's *alter ego,* as Professor Joseph J. Reilley has dubbed him, was *the* most Italianate Englishman of his day. (ALICE MCLARNEY.)

FALKNER, THOMAS, S. J., *A Description of Patagonia and the Adjoining Parts of South America.* With an Introduction and Notes by Arthur E. S. Neumann. (Chicago, Armann and Armann, 1935, pp. viii, iv, 168, $6.) This book is a facsimile copy of the original edition of the *Description of Patagonia* published in 1774—a book used as a scientific guide on the *Beagle* and commended by the Royal Geographical Society in 1836 as the only reliable description of the country south of Buenos Aires. Copies of the original edition have long been very rare, and no other edition has appeared. Students of Hispanic American life should be gratified by the appearance of this reprint.

Among the many excellent contributions to the natural and social history of Hispanic America made by Catholic missionaries, this *Description* is notable as the work of an *English* missionary in Spanish America. Falkner, a physician by profession, entered service (1731) as a surgeon on a South

Sea Company boat trading slaves to the Plata country. Serious illness made it necessary that he be left in Buenos Aires when the boat returned. Nursed to health by the Jesuits, he joined the Society, attended their college in Buenos Aires and later the famous University of Cordoba. He was sent as a missionary to the Indians of Paraguay and northern Argentina. Successful work in these regions led to his being selected to go to Patagonia, then little known to the Spanish. There he labored until the Jesuits were expelled from Spanish America in 1767.

The *Description* contains, as the title page indicates, an "account of the soil, produce, animals, vales, mountains, rivers, lakes, etc., of those countries; the religion, government, policy, customs, dress, arms, and language of the Indian inhabitants; and some particulars relating to the Falkland Islands." To the reviewer Falkner's discussion of plant life is particularly attractive. The book is very valuable to the ethnologist and historian for its description of the culture of the Indians of Patagonia, including the famous Moloches (Araucanians) and the less well-known Tsonecans and Gennakens. The two excellent and intriguing maps of the original edition are reproduced. The value of this reprint is increased by the addition of a biographical sketch of Falkner, useful explanatory notes, and a good index—all contributions of the editor. The book is a beautiful piece of craftsmanship in format and printing. (MARY WATTERS.)

FANFANI, AMINTORE, *Catholicism, Protestantism and Capitalism.* (New York, Sheed & Ward Inc., 1935, pp. v, 224, $2.00.) With a notable fairness, a commendable fullness and a catholic range, the arresting problem of the relation of capitalism to Christianity is treated in this volume. This presentation of the rise of capitalism in a truly Catholic environment will make those who heretofore accepted the views of Weber and those also of Tawney stop, look and listen. Protestants of the honest and sincere sort will naturally not like this volume. It shows too convincingly the rôle Protestantism played in aiding the development of the capitalistic spirit. To date, no volume has explained the relation of capitalism with Catholicism and Protestantism so adequately and so correctly. (L. L. MCVAY.)

FLICK, ALEXANDER CLARENCE, *Modern World History since 1775: A Survey of the Origins and Development of Contemporary Civilization.* Revised by Witt Bowden. (New York, F. S. Crofts & Co., 1935, pp. xii, 667, $5.00.) From the objective standpoint, Flick-Bowden's *Modern World History since 1775* is a valuable guidebook in the labyrinth of events that have brought about our modern civilization. Insufficient for the political, social, or economic histories of any one country, society or movement, it still remains a guide to these by the selected list of reference books joined to every one of the 45 chapters into which the work is divided. Its usefulness lies in that general survey which examines the most important events of the last 160 years and brings some order, unity, and continuity into the chaos that historical events are when viewed singly. The subtitle shows that such was the aim of the authors; the book itself shows that this ideal presided over its composition; the result is a panoramic view of the forces, processes and achievements of this

period. These are distributed into ten parts, each one combining the events of a particular epoch with a general tendency supposed to be then more in evidence than at other times. If there is something artificial in this arrangement, there is nevertheless a sufficient foundation for it in history, and it certainly aids in focusing the reader's attention.

The subjective prepossessions of the authors demand a more reserved attitude. The spirit of the age is the spirit of the authors. In a work so ample generalizations are necessary; details are omitted; distinctions are lost sight of. The Church becomes a historical unit, even in purely political questions, and is generally on the wrong side of the fence. Opposition, reaction, hostility to progress all along the line, these are its attributes. After studying the work, the impression remains that Gambetta's famous outburst "Clericalism, that is our enemy" (p. 278) represents somehow the attitude of the authors. Little is said of the Church that is to its credit. Even the fact that it controlled education at a time when there was no education but under its auspices is made a grievance, as if that control had been merely a means to maintain a power which had no basis in fact. This attitude, in spite of the attempt to appear fairminded, leads to seemingly contradictory statements. Thus, though the conservatism of the Church, "autocracy in Church and State" before the French Revolution, is made responsible for ills that led to that violent upheaval, the book elsewhere states that the Revolution began in France "not because the people there were more oppressed than elsewhere, but because, like the Americans, they were more advanced and better off than any other large national group in continental Europe" (p. 69). Again, on page 62 we read that before the Revolution "Protestants in France were outlawed, their children were illegitimate, and they were refused burial in Catholic cemeteries. Nor could they legally inherit or bequeath proptrey." Two pages further on we read: "In Catholic France likewise, where public opinion was very enlightened and would not have tolerated religious persecution, no serious attempt had been made to enforce the harsh laws for many years." Anecdotes—words said more in jest than in all earnestness—are hardly fit material in a general history, however piquant their insinuations. Here is an example (p. 74): "A Paris curate who was asked whether the clergy really believed the doctrines they taught, replied: 'There may be four or five who do.' At a dinner in Paris the Englishmen Hume chanced to remark that he had never met an atheist. 'At present moment,' replied the host, 'you are sitting at table with seventeen of them.'" Incidentally be it said that this page in a footnote (footnotes are extremely rare in this work) refers to *Cath. Ency.* "France" VI. 184. An examination of that page and other pages does not at all bear out the statement of the text. Is this throwing dust in the eyes of the reader?

The worst offences of this nature are found in the concluding part. Here are a few statements which it is needless to comment upon, as the confusion of thought implied in most of them is an indictment not of the Church or Christianity, but of those who can glibly write them in a work of general world history: "The Roman Catholics refused to accept the conclusions of scientific investigations or explained them as pertaining to material things

and not to the Deity and man's soul" (p. 637). "The study of comparative religions in western schools and the voluminous literature describing the life and customs of other peoples have tended to break down the older conception of Christianity as the only 'true' religion." (p. 638). "In France, Ernest Renan applied the theory (of evolution) to comparative religions, and reached the conclusion that the Bible and the Christian theology were but an evolution of primitive religious ideas" (p. 645). "The organic, unitary view of personality . . . has given to the older conceptions of free will and determinism an air of unreality. It has tended to undermine the older basis of ethics. . . . While it has undermined the traditional basis of free will and moral responsibility, it has thrown much light on the nature and control of behavior and has emphasized the importance of social and environmental stilmuli in the discipline and development of individuals and groups" (p. 639). "Pope Pius IX declared that Darwin's theory was the product of a depraved nature and a silly effort to make a monkey out of man" (p. 645). For such statements, whether true or false, we have a right to ask for, and the authors have a duty to give references.

To sum up. As historians, the writers deserve our thanks for giving us a history of a most important period, and especially of the latest events down to the present day; as propagandists, their sympathies are all for democracy and incline them to be slightly unjust to other forms of government; as theorists, they take their stand irrevocably on the theory of evolution, and they fail to see that a government of the people by the people does not exclude, but demands the recognition of God as the ultimate source of all authority to which both governors and governed must bow; as positivists, they regard religion as one of the forces which the historian cannot ignore, though all his sympathies are for those who undermine its authority. The historian will find in this work much to delight him. The defender of Christian civilization will find in it little to help him, except that he can acquaint himself with the other view, quite current nowadays. For these reasons I would not see the work placed in the hands of immature minds or poorly instructed Catholics. (A. BELLWALD, S. M.)

FOLEY, LOUIS, *The Greatest Saint of France.* (Milwaukee, Morehouse Publishing Company, 1931, pp. xi, 321, $3.50.) In simple, unaffected language, the author tells the powerful story of the greatest saint of France. Humble, ascetic, and kind, Saint Martin of Tours was the great apostle of Gaul. To him belongs a share of the credit for the institution of Western monasticism. Even after he had been elected Bishop of the Tourones by popular acclaim, Martin did not lose his love for his monastic establishment. Here he imparted discipline, a love for prayer, and especially for study, to his pupils, many of whom became bishops and so spread his influence. Through his organization and his direct attacks on paganism, then strongly rooted in Gaul, he raised his diocese to a position of importance. Priests trained by him were sent to consolidate the gains Martin himself made in the pagan districts. Great honor and fame came to Martin because of his wonderful thaumaturgy. More than once he brought people, presumably dead, back to life by prayer. After his death, Martin's tomb became a shrine, made rich

by the vast numbers of pilgrims. Professor Foley has given us a sympathetic picture of Martin, founded on many authentic documents. The biography of Sulpicius Severus is the main source. A simple, scholarly, direct, and forceful book, it has characteristics like those of its subject. Saint Martin's importance cannot be overestimated. He gave the church of Gaul its impetus and vigor. The abbey he founded at Tours became renowned for its scholars. When Charles the Great wished to give Alcuin his well-earned reward, he could find no greater one than to make him abbot of Tours, abbot of the monastery founded four centuries earlier by Saint Martin. (W. J. SCHIFFERLI.)

FRASER, J. ALBAN, *Spain and the West Country.* (London, Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 1935, pp. 330.) The reader should not be misled by the gay popular format of this book, for it is really a treasure-house of the local history underlying that part of English history that most attracts American students and American readers of fiction. Much of the material is taken from the archives of the churches and Corporation of Bristol, England, and have to do with the relations of that seaport with the Iberian Peninsula from the twelfth century down to the nineteenth. Many of these records have been heretofore unpublished and, set against a background of the history of England in its relations with Spain, and to a much lesser extent with Portugal, they make of this volume what Ramiro de Maetzu calls in the introduction "a work . . . remarkable for its learning." The author deals mostly with maritime history, but, since crises in the relations of Spain and England almost always involved maritime history, the miniatures which the author sets forth in his chapters are all of importance. Beginning about 1170, with the days of Alfonso VIII of Castile and his Plantagenet wife, Eleanor, the author takes us through the early centuries when the destinies of England and Spain became almost inseparable, economically as well as spiritually, through the ages of the guilds and the pilgrimages to Santiago de Compostela, down to the Reformation, when England broke with Christendom and Spain did what she could for English Catholics by the establishment of English seminaries and colleges at Valladolid and elsewhere. We see, too, the Catholic courtesy and judicial fairness which Englishmen met in Spain even during the harsh early days of the Reformation, and the churlishness and double-dealing with which they often repaid them. There is a bit of new information about even such well-studied characters as Cromwell and Raleigh. Again, what every historian knows but few popular writers seem ever to have read, the author repeats: "Spain and Portugal in the sixteenth century owed their maritime supremacy and their empires not only to the skill and daring of their navigators, but to their knowledge of the exact sciences." And this he demonstrates. Mr. Fraser says with great modesty that "it has not been the writer's purpose to do more than collect, as far as possible from original and unbiased sources, a few of the episodes and data that clear the old-time relations of England and Spain from some of the distortions and misrepresentations of school textbooks and popular fiction." He has done much more, and his book deserves a widespread and numerous public. (ELIZABETH W. LOUGHRAN.)

GARRETT, MITCHELL B., *The Estates General of 1789: The Problems of Composition and Organization.* [The American Historical Association.] (New York, London, D. Appleton-Century Company Inc., 1935, pp. viii, 268, $3.00.) In July, 1788, Louis XVI of France issued an appeal to his subjects for information as to the best way to convoke the Estates General of the kingdom. The collective answer which was given him was embodied in hundreds of pamphlets published between the date of his request and January 24, 1789. These pamphlets have been carefully studied by Professor Garrett as an accurate indication of French public opinion with regard to the Estates General. He has completed a splendid work in bringing together and analyzing the great mass of this material, and in presenting the student with a satisfactory picture of public opinion on the eve of the Revolution. Not the least contribution of his book is its remarkable bibliography, in which are listed chronologically all of the pamphlets relating to the Estates General published in France during the period he discusses. The value of this unique compilation is greatly enhanced by Professor Garrett's notes on the authorship and date of publication of anonymous and undated pamphlets. (JOHN J. MENG.)

HAIMAN, MIECISLAUS, *The Fall of Poland in Contemporary American Opinion.* (Chicago, Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, 1935, pp. xv, 271.) In a prefatory note the author informs his readers that his book is intended as a commentary and augmentative of the first chapter of his earlier work, *Poland and the American Revolutionary War.* He cherishes the hope that his new writing will help to strengthen the ancient ties of friendship between the United States and Poland. One should mention that John Cudahy, the American Ambassador in Warsaw, has written a brief foreword to the book. The volume consists mainly of excerpts from the American press pertaining to the partitions of Poland and the fate of Kosciuszko after his defeat by the Russians. It becomes apparent that the Americans were at that time singularly well-informed about Polish affairs, perhaps better than today. Mr. Haiman has sifted a vast amount of material and produced a work which will no doubt enhance his reputation as a scholar and research worker. (J. J. ROLBIECKI.)

HAWKS, EDWARD, *William McGarvey and the Open Pulpit.* (Philadelphia, The Dolphin Press, 1935, pp. vii, 258, $2.00.) The oft-repeated statement to a Catholic by a member of the Episcopal Church that his church is very near to the Roman Catholic Church is both a confession and a wistful longing. It is an expression of wistful longing because it indicates that the Episcopalian desires to be regarded as a member of a branch of the true, Catholic and universal Church; as he puts it—the Greek, Roman, and Anglican branches of the Church founded by Jesus Christ. In short, he longs to feel secure. This sort of wistfulness has long been a characteristic of the High Church Anglicans. They have never failed to look to Rome and have ever hoped that the See of Peter would be able to devise some means whereby they could as a group come back to the fold founded by Christ. Dr. Hawks has in this volume before us dispelled this futile hope of the High Church group among

Episcopalians. With vigor, honesty and factual evidences the reverend author shows that the Episcopal Church is as far from the Church founded by Jesus Christ as are the Methodists, Presbyterians, and Unitarians. This is the most tragic lesson taught by this timely volume. The members of the Episcopal Church, and especially that branch known as the Anglo-Catholics, as a result of this work, are left without a rudder in the turbulent sea of indifference. In this well-written volume, the reader is given an accurate picture of the Anglo-Catholic movement begun in 1870 by Dr. Percival and ending so tragically by the "Open Pulpit" decision at Richmond in 1908. The part played by the masterful mind of William McGarvey in the protest to this unfortunate decision and the subsequent conversion of himself and some twenty other Anglican clergymen is given with detailed clearness and intimacy. This volume is written as a fulfillment of the dying request of Monsignor McGarvey, by one of his nearest and dearest friends. (LEO L. MCVAY.)

The History of The Times: "The Thunderer" in the Making 1785-1841. Vol. I. (New York, Macmillan, 1935, pp. x, 514, $5.00.) Although the stated purpose of this set is to portray "the history of *The Times*, not of contemporary politics," nevertheless this first volume, by which we must judge the set until the remainder appears, is important in narrating from original and sometimes inaccessible sources the very large part "The Thunderer" played in forming English opinion on every major topic from 1785 onward. The set promises to be indispensable to the historian interested in the interactions between journalism and politics. The two appendices present hitherto unpublished documents showing the "relations of governments and the press" and a complete bibliography of the sources used. This first volume has its own index. (E. P. WILLGING.)

HODGKIN, R. H., Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Oxford, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons.* 2 vols. (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1935, pp. xxvii, xii, 748, $10.00.) These two volumes of nearly 800 pages are the first work of its kind for more than a quarter of a century—since, indeed, the 550-page one volume of Mr. Hodgkin's father, Thomas Hodgkin, in 1906, *The History of the Anglo-Saxons to the Norman Conquest.* The present history covers only that part of its predecessor which reaches down to the culmination and golden age of Anglo-Saxon civilization under Alfred the Great. Yet there is no padding of the material that lies back of the work, and the reader would gladly have more of the flow of logical historical synthesis in Mr. Hodgkin's lucid and readable style. The last quarter century's philological and archaeological discovery and research have sometimes seriously called into question the reliability of previous methods of historical approach to the early English period, and challenged some, if not many, of the tenets formerly held. Mr. Hodgkin evaluates the new correlations set up of the archaeological and philological deposits in museums and libraries, utilizes the new discoveries which exhumations of graves and burial mounds make so abundantly possible for us of today through the instrumentality of air photography, and generally finds that, while the old views may have to be greatly modified, modern re-

search and discovery have, at least to the present, kept intact the essentialities of the old accounts in Bede and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, in Nennius and Gildas.

Nevertheless, a keener appreciation and a better understanding is had from his volumes of the migrations of the Angles and Saxons along the northwestern litoral of Europe from the narrow pinch of the Juttish peninsula to the projecting head of land near Calais, whence from various points of vantage easy access was had to the shores of England. This is the subject matter of Chapter I, II and IV of the first volume. The account is broken (Chap. III) by a restatement of the Juttish question, that of the conquest by Hengist and Horsa. If there is fabulousness in the duality of leadership in the invaders, and in the alliteration of their names, the historicity of a Juttish chieftain, perhaps Hengist by name, with the military genius of the later Vikings for instance, establishing his sway some remote distance from home, and with bands of recruited adventurers setting out whither fame and fortune beckon, becomes not so unlikely as to doubt Bede, even though Bede himself gives us cause to raise the doubt. But Mr. Hodgkin is not quite ready to see in the early emergence and power of Kent a Juttish question; rather he regards the glory that was Kent a Kentish question—a natural evolution in Kent itself from its favored position in the trade routes.

The second volume is concerned largely with the deep cultural as well as religious effects the coming and spread of Christianity had on the Anglo-Saxons, and towards the end rather graphically has history repeated itself in the fall of the Anglo-Saxon civilization by the invasion of the Danes, accomplished much by the same processes and routes as obtained in the Anglo-Saxon invasion. Readers will find in this volume a keener understanding than they may have had heretofore of the intensity and seriousness of the English conversion from paganism, the views expressed, too, springing inevitably out of the historical facts presented, and attempted in no wise in any special apologetic sense. A word must be added in regard to the maps, plates (four beautifully colored), headpieces, tailpieces, and text figures, some 300 or so in all, with which the volumes are furnished. A study of these alone would add much to a fair historical apprehension of the period treated. The work of Mr. Hodgkin will prove a needful addition to public and school libraries, and would add to the value of any private collection. (F. J. HEMELT.)

HORRABIN, JAMES F., *An Atlas of Current Affairs.* (New York, F. S. Crofts and Co., second revised edition, 1935, pp. x, 149, $1.00.) This is a collection of simple but accurate maps showing the changes in European frontiers since the Treaty of Versailles, the conflicting interests in the Mediterranean and the Near East, the Negro problem in the United States, the expansion of Japan, the Russian frontiers, and the geographical problems in the Pacific, in Africa, and in South America. Each map is accompanied by a brief note summarizing some contemporary historical problem. (J. C.)

JACKS, L. V., *Mother Marianne of Molokai.* (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1935, pp. xvi, 203, $2.00.) In the preface of this little book the author discusses some of the ordinary methods of writing a biography, but in composing his own account of Mother Marianne of Molokai, he has em-

ployed a technique which is quite extraordinary. Biographies generally emphasize the character whose life is discussed and make all other events subservient to such discussion. Mr. Jacks prefers to narrate a number of events and let the subject of his sketch just flit across the scene, entering and disappearing so rapidly that one never has a satisfactory look at her. This, however, is not altogether without merit in the case of the present work, for the subject of it is a Franciscan nun, Sister Marianne Kopp, of the congregation of Syracuse, N. Y., who spent her life among the lepers of the Hawaiian Islands. Her ability to influence happenings, while keeping just outside of the lime light, is probably a very true representation of the actual life which she led through a series of stirring happenings from the day when she brought the first Sisters to the aid of the heroic Damien until her death in 1918. However, as a biography, the book leaves one with a feeling of disappointment. The reader is never allowed to become intimately acquainted with the woman who transformed the leper settlement of Molokai from a horrible place of exile to a haven of charity. The book tells the story of the transformation rather than that of the transformer.

Though Mr. Jacks claims to have had plenty of source material (pp. ix to xiv), he quotes but eight sources in his bibliography (pp. 197-198), excusing the fact by the remark that "a bibliography about leprosy alone would fill whole books. There are endless works about the South Sea." What one would like to know is how much material he found which dealt with Sister Marianne. The author refers to "309 documents" furnished him from the Franciscan archives. He nowhere evaluates them, and to judge from his study, they dealt rather largely with things instead of persons. In passing, it might be said that the bibliography is unsatisfactory from another standpoint, authors' names are not given in full and the place and date of publication are omitted.

Despite the faults noted the book is an interesting introduction to a woman whose life deserves a more complete study. Moreover, Mr. Jacks writes well when dealing with topics where source material was plentiful. For example, his descriptions of the early conditions at Molokai (p. 54 *et seq.*), the death of Father Damien (Chap. VI), the visit of Robert L. Stevenson to the leper colony (p. 103 *et seq.*) are all well handled; but as soon as he writes directly of Mother Marianne, his style becomes jerky, taking for granted much that should be explained and verging closely on the old style hagiography. Frequently the author eulogizes particular virtues of the nun with almost no other evidence for his praise than that one would expect to find them in a woman who had consecrated her life to self-sacrifice. No doubt the present work will arouse interest, and perhaps lead to the discovery of more information about the good Sister. Then a more thorough history of her may be written. (RAPHAEL N. HAMILTON, S. J.)

JOHNSON, GEORGE, Ph. D., JEROME D. HANNAN, Ph. D., J. D. C., and Sr. M. DOMINICA, O. S. U., Ph. D., *The Story of the Church*. (New York, Benziger Brothers, 1935, pp. xliv, 503.) In this timely volume, written for the pupils of the upper grades of our Catholic parish schools, the story of the one true Church is impressively told in three main parts: as she was during the days

of the Roman Empire, then through the dynamic medieval period, and finally as Christ's Church is at the present time. The basic aim of this volume is to enkindle a love for Christ in His Church through a knowledge of her glories, her trials, her achievements in the upbuilding of civilization. What Confirmation does sacramentally for our Catholic pupils, this volume will do socially for those who use it. It will fire the Catholic men and women of tomorrow with an understanding love and loyalty for the Church of which they are an integral part. The pedagogical features of this work will render it a valuable factor in character building, as they throw to the fore those forces resident in the students that make for self-development and mastery. The facts making up the story of the work of the Catholic Church as we know her in her relation to all that is best in the human sciences will be rendered more functional in the lives of the students, and thus they will be helped to understand better, as they learn to know, how the Church became what she is today, the only haven for social security and progress. (L. L. McVAY.)

LUNN, ARNOLD, *A Saint in the Slave Trade: Peter Claver.* (Sheed and Ward, New York, 1935, pp. 256, $2.50.) Contrary to what one might expect from the title of this book, it is neither a biography of St. Peter Claver nor a discussion of the slave trade. It is a disquisition on sanctity, using the life of the patron saint of the Negro missions as a vehicle and his service of the slaves as a background for a rationalization of sanctity as approved to mere humanitarianism. Historically the author's defence of the Catholic attitude toward slavery is only fair. Hagiographically, his treatment of a Jesuit of Cartegna is better. Ascetically his sortie against the citadel of would-be-debunkers of our saints is best. The executor of the jacket design should be executed—it is execrable. (JOHN T. GILLARD, S. S. J.)

MANROSS, WILLIAM W., *A History of the American Episcopal Church.* (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Morehouse Publishing Co., 1935, pp. iv, 404, $2.75.) One of the wisest has written, "Of the making of books, there is no end"; and the same may be said of the histories of the Christian Church and of its different branches. The last one to appear, of that branch of the Christian Church known as the American Episcopal Church, has been written by the Rev. William W. Manross, M. A., Fellow and Tutor of the General Theological Seminary of New York. The Rev. Dr. Tiffany, the author of a well-known history of the American Episcopal Church, closed his work with the year 1895; since that date many important events and great growth needed to be chronicled. Of these Mr. Manross treats in great detail. He says: "The aim of this history is to show the American Episcopal Church as a living institution." We believe that he has accomplished his purpose. He has had the opportunity of drawing material from original sources—more notably than other historians, especially the Rev. Dr. McConnell (1916).

Beginning with the Church in its struggles in Virginia, the author gives great credit to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for its missionary work on these shores. A combination of Church and State which is never thought of now loomed in the early part of the seventeenth century when "no minister should be allowed to officiate unless he could show the

governor a certificate of his ordination by some bishop in England, and would promise to conform to the standards of the English Church. Any other minister was to be silenced by the governor, and if he proved obdurate, expelled from the colony." Such a condition, coupled with the hatred of England on the part of the colonists, had much to do with the weakness of the Episcopal Church in the colonies. After the Revolution at one time it seemed as if the Church established on these American shores by the Church of England would be silenced. Again, "the lack of central authority" in the episcopate militated largely against the growth of the Church. Add to this the hatred of the Church by the Puritans of New England, and we have a dark picture for the future of the American Episcopal Church. In the chapter on the "Struggle for the Episcopate," Mr. Manross brings out clearly the great need for a resident episcopate, and the more or less intermittent campaign carried on for this prime object. The "let-well-enough-alone policy" that characterized the English government under the first two Georges kept the weak American Church from that which the author believes would have strengthened it, namely, the episcopate. This chapter is one of the most illuminating in the whole book. Especially good is Chapter IX, "The Revolution and Reorganization." After the Revolution and the consecration of Samuel Seabury as the first Bishop, the Church grew rapidly. With the founding of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society in 1820, the Church started actively to send missionaries to the West, and to found schools and colleges. The Oxford Movement and its efforts is an interesting chapter, as also, the Church during the Civil War. During this unfortunate struggle when party strife was at red heat, though the Church in the North and South did not meet in council, still, wise heads prevented separation, so that after "the late unpleasantness" and at the Convention of 1865, though the South was crushed, when the Diocese of Alabama was called, there was a representative to answer the roll call for that diocese. In the last chapter the author touches upon different phases of Church life in the last twenty years.

Taken as a whole, this history is heartily commended, both for accuracy and interest, especially to the laity. (CHARLES T. WARNER.)

MCLAUGHLIN, ANDREW C., Professor Emeritus of History, University of Chicago, *A Constitutional History of the United States.* (New York, D. Appleton-Century Co., 1935, pp. xi, 818.) This volume of Professor McLaughlin belongs to the Century Political Science Series. Its purpose, defined by the author at the opening of his preface, "is to present briefly and clearly the constitutional history of the United States during nearly two centuries." Its contents, stretching through fifty-one chapters deal with the constitutional problem amongst the English colonies before the Albany Plan down to the burning constitutional issues of our day, though the author states in his preface that he has "not attempted to trace constitutional developments after 1932." Professor McLaughlin has written his history in large measure, as one might expect, from cases, there being in all 342 referred to in the volume. Moreover, the footnotes contain many pertinent references to important sources in both primary and secondary classifications. An appendix reprints the Constitution, and there is a complete "Table of Cases" arranged in an

order which will enable quick and convenient reference. An excellent index accompanies the volume. Altogether it is a book which professors of American Constitutional History will welcome for use as a text for students, or even for reference; its recent award of the Pulitzer prize in history is testimony of its worth. (JOHN TRACY ELLIS.)

MUNICH, AUSTIN FRANCIS, *The Beginnings of Roman Catholicism in Connecticut.* (Yale University Press, 1935, pp. 31, $0.25.) This brochure is the forty-first in a series being issued by the Tercentenary Commission of the State of Connecticut. The beginnings of the Catholic Church in Connecticut were very different from the origins of the same Church in the other states. The author traces this unique development lending particular stress to the influences of immigration. He gives a good synthesis of the hardships and difficulties of the earlier bishops and the remarkable work they accomplished. He gives an account of the Barber family and concludes with a brief description of the Catholic Church in Connecticut today. A bibliographical note is appended. (JOHN CADDEN.)

MUNRO, DANA C., *The Kingdom of the Crusaders.* Student's Edition. (New York and London, D. Appleton-Century Company Inc., 1935, pp. ix, 216.) The present work is in substance eight lectures on the Crusades delivered as the Lowell Lectures at Harvard in 1924. The author had intended, after his long life as a teacher and scholar, to write an elaborate history of the Crusades, but a sudden death cut short his plans. Hence this book is only a skeleton of a projected work on a large and detailed scale. It betrays its lecture origin by its familiar style and total lack of critical notes and specific references to sources, although verbatim extracts from chronicles are liberally introduced. The eight chapters of the book are: I. The Land and the People; II. The Conquest of the Land; III. Establishment of the Kingdom; IV. The Kingdom at its Zenith; V. Relations between Crusaders and Natives; VI. The Decline of the Kingdom; VII. Saladin and the Loss of the Kingdom; VIII. Importance of the Kingdom of the Crusaders. The work closes with a classified list of D. C. Munro's writings on the Crusades and with a brief index. Two maps and eight illustrations supplement the text. The book, then, is a popularly written but in the main a trustworthy sketch of certain aspects of the Crusades. That all scholars regard in such a favorable light as did Professor Munro the amicable relations that were established between Christians and Moslems in the East at the sacrifice of Christian principles and ideals is, however, a matter open to question. (M. R. P. M.)

O'BRIEN, LOUIS, *The Writing of History.* Adapted from Paul Harsin's *Comment on Écrit l'Histoire.* (Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press, 1935, pp. 96.) A pathetic memory will always be attached to this scholarly adaptation of Professor Harsin's little book on historical composition (CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, XX, April, 1935, 100). Young in years but mature in his scholarship, beloved by all, teachers and students, who knew him at the University of California, Louis O'Brien died on September 6, 1935. His *Innocent X, and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* (1930) gave

promise of a splendid career in his chosen field of historical research. Those who heard his paper on "The Huguenot Policy of Louis XIV and Pope Innocent XI" (CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, XVII, April, 1931, pp. 35-43), read at the Boston (1930) meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, were charmed by Dr. O'Brien's scholarship as well as by his personality. His rendering into clear and crisp English of M. Harsin's study is a welcome addition to the treatises we possess in English on historical synthesis. There are distinctive features about this manual that make it welcome in all seminars. While every effort was made to keep the general sense of the original, Dr. O'Brien has not hesitated to replace Mr. Harsin's historical allusions by others more familiar to American students. (P. G.)

RONAN, MYLES V., *The Irish Martyrs of the Penal Laws.* (London, Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd., 1935, pp. ix, 214.) Father Ronan, in this expository book, has traced the martyrdom of many Irish, both clergy and laity, to the penal laws promulgated in Ireland by the English under the Tudors, Stuarts, and Cromwell. He proves that the charges of high treason so often brought against Catholics rested, in the majority of cases, not on counter-government plots, as was usually alleged, but merely on the fact that, as Catholics, they practised their religion. The author does not build his case out of conjecture, but goes to the authentic sources and contemporary documents. The vast amount of research necessary for the writing of this book is made evident by the scholarly treatment of subject, and by the extensive bibliography. Informative and interesting, it will suit the ordinary reader admirably, and will prove to be for the student a valuable guide to contemporary works. (W. J. SCHIFFERLI.)

ROUSE, MICHAEL FRANCIS (Brother Bede, C. F. X.), *A Study of the Development of Negro Education Under Catholic Auspices in Maryland and the District of Columbia.* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935, pp. 125, $1.25.) This doctoral dissertation is an excellent piece of work done in a field too long neglected by research students. It is one of the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Education. Through nine chapters the author traces his subject from the beginning of the colony of Maryland to the present day. Because of the paucity of previous compilations covering Catholic activity in behalf of the American Negro, the author had to go to original sources. In this regard he was fortunate in having at his command original documents from archives and reports on matters not ordinarily available. The work is highly commendable and the author reflects credit on the teaching order to which he belongs. Incidentally, Hopkins is doing far more in Negro historical matters than any Catholic institution; this work is a sample. (JOHN T. GILLARD, S. S. J.)

ROZ, FIRMIN, *Vue Générale de l'Histoire du Canada.* (Paris, Paul Hartmann, 1934, pp. xxi, 331.) This volume is not as the author states "une oeuvre critique, fondée sur l'étude et la discussion des documents originaux. . . . Le dessin, beaucoup plus modeste et limité . . . n'est autre que de faire connâitre aux lecteurs français . . . la suite des principaux événements à travers lesquels la Nouvelle France, devenue colonie anglaise après la défaite

de 1759 et le traité de 1763, a donné naissance au Canada d'aujourd'hui, de les expliquer en les ordonnant et de marquer la part des principaux personnages qui ont été les agents de cette evolution ou de ce progrès." Firmin Roz is eminently qualified to discuss this subject as he has already produced several works that are favorably known on this side of the Atlantic. Those who are familiar with his *Washington, L'énergie américaine, De Roosevelt à Hoover* will derive great pleasure and much knowledge from this latest venture into the field of popular history.

The volume has two major divisions: I. L'Epopée Canadienne et le Régime Français (1534-1760); II. Le Développment des Provinces Anglaises (1760-1867), and comprises nineteen illuminating chapters all of which are well paragraphed, each paragraph being introduced with bold-face type.

The author maintains that French Canadians have been a prime factor in the upbuilding of the Canadian nation. He says: "Un double mouvement, qui correspond sans doute à une double origine, oriente vers deux pôles, entre lesquels il semble que cette nation doive trouver son équilibre, les destins du Canada. . . . Nous le voyons réaliser de plus en plus complètement l'autonomie nationale dans l'unité impériale. C'est l'élément français qui a le plus contribué à le faire évoluer dans le premier sens et l'élément anglais dans le second. Leur lutte est le drame de son histoire; leur accord, l'éxplication de son progrès" (p. 316).

The bibliography, if not extensive, is quite comprehensive. Yet I personally believe that it would be more valuable if reference were made to the learned volumes of Laverdière and Ferland, those brilliant professors of Laval University, who contributed so largely towards a better understanding of the achievements of French Canadians. (P. W. BROWNE.)

SEYMOUR, CHARLES, *American Neutrality, 1914-1917.* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1935, pp. vii, 187, $2.00.) This timely thesis explains the neutrality policy of Wilson from 1914 to 1917. It is of special interest in view of the renewal of the acknowledged inadequate act of August 21, 1935. Seymour claims that the reason we entered the Great War was solely because of the renewal of the unrestricted German U-boat campaign. Upon this, Bernstorff, Grey, and Lansing are shown to agree. This is the main purpose of the treatise. Not to "save the skins of bankers," but because of the U-boat warfare did we enter. But the author does not distinguish between the proximate reason, which is the one stated, and the remote or ultimate reason. This is a breach of the philosophic method of history. No mention is made of the Catholic spirit of neutrality in this country, nor of the peace efforts of Benedict XV, with which an unprejudiced, sincere Wilson would have coöperated. Seymour underestimates the power of the press in swaying sympathies to one side, and overlooks the fact that the press of America was a capitalistic press, and therefore controlled by the monied interests. He holds that as far as we were concerned, it was not a political nor an economic war, but an emotional war. This is true as regards the great mass of the people, but is it true as regards our leaders who put us into the war? Seymour strikes at Senator Nye's bill for neutrality. He shows that it is possible to have a fixed neutrality policy, but that it is extremely difficult, if not impos-

sible, to keep it fixed when conditions make it appear undesirable. The practicality of a fixed embargo is as questionable for the future as it was impossible in 1916. In the concluding chapter, Seymour makes a masterful summation and crystallizes his charges against automatic embargoes, which he labels "impractical" and "dangerous." Only to the charge of partizanship does he lay himself open, because of his rigid championing of Wilson, admitting no mistakes in his policy. (W. J. SCHIFFERLI.)

STEPHENSON, CARL, *Mediaeval History: Europe from the Fourth to the Sixteenth Century.* (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1935, pp. xviii, 797, $3.50.) In this attempt "by emphasizing chronological development, to give a comprehensive view of European civilization stage by stage in preference to a political narrative with a series of postscripts on other phases of life," Professor Stephenson has succeeded admirably. In each successive period, the relations between social, cultural and political achievements are clearly indicated. A generous amount of space is allotted to intellectual, literary and artistic developments. With a few exceptions, the treatment of the Church is reasonably objective. The implication of pp. 83 ff. is that the primacy of the Roman see was more the result of civic importance and "historical circumstance" than of spiritual preëminence. The papal position in the fifteenth century is misunderstood. Surely the following on Eugenius IV and the Council of Basel should be questioned: "Whatever the saving theories that might be presented by the legal-minded, the actual sovereign of the church had proved to be not the pope, but the council" (p. 677). Designed as a college text, the volume is unusually well supplied with maps, diagrams, illustrations of contemporary art and architecture, tables, chronological charts and index. A selected, critical bibliography, mainly of titles in English, unfortunately omits the works of Christopher Dawson, and incorrectly cites Summerfield Baldwin, *The Organization of Mediaeval Christianity* (New York, 1929), as written "from the Protestant point of view" (p. 754). (MARSHALL W. BALDWIN.)

STYRON, ARTHUR, *The Cast-Iron Man: Calhoun and American Democracy.* (New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1935, pp. 426, $3.50.) When a man writes a biography he is face to face with a problem. What shall he leave out and what shall he insert? To strike a balance, to choose wisely is a feat. Painting a hero's environment in the hope of showing its influence on his life is a noble attempt. For this reason, no doubt, Mr. Styron saw fit to devote many pages to European history of the late eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries. The reader is confronted with a list of names from John Locke to Prince Klemens Metternich; with the Holy Alliance, chronic French Revolutions, the European upheaval of 1849. One holds his breath, and perforce must pause to get his bearings.

Some of this no doubt shaped the life of Calhoun and the course of democracy in America. But aside from following this intricate connection between the old and the new worlds the reader may enjoy the shifting scenes—now France, now Italy, and again America. In the midst of it all you must hold fast to the main character, John C. Calhoun; and if you are patient you will

reach the end having much more than the story of one of America's greatest heroes.

Through a maze of events Calhoun passes. There were annexations of new territories, the development of industry in the North, the building of railroads and the agitation to settle the slavery question. Was the South to withdraw from the Union and set up a state of its own? That was the burning question when Calhoun died in 1850. On this subject he made his last plea, declaring "that the agitation of the subject of slavery would, if not prevented by some timely and effective measure, end in disunion." The speech was read by his friend James Murray Mason of Virginia, for Calhoun had now grown old and feeble. The scene is vivid; Calhoun sits listening wrapped in a shawl. The author details the story of how this agitation developed and reached the breaking point in the middle of the nineteenth century. One can agree with Mr. Styron that the cry of the North to abolish Negro slavery in the South was inconsistent in view of the industrial slavery of the New England mills.

In his chapter entitled *Postscript*, Mr. Styron writes with vigor about the Negro who "had never excelled in the arts, the sciences and the philosophies." For him the Negro belongs to an inferior race and should remain in "tutelage of a superior race until they [the Negroes] should be able to appreciate the benefits and advantages of civilization." That there may be a superior race has not yet been proved. Moreover, the African is credited with contributing to culture, the most important single thing, namely, iron work, an art which runs deep into African history.

On one page the author writes about the slave-owners teaching the Negroes Christian civilization and thus raising them "to a higher level—than anywhere else on the globe." On another page he paints a dark picture of the dire consequences of emancipating "three-million childish, semi-savage people." This no doubt is Mr. Styron's conviction, but it is hardly complementary. Would that the author had restrained himself instead of bringing in such devastating remarks at the end of a book that is otherwise rather dispassionately treated. All in all the book is heavy; but lightened here and there by graphic descriptions of Washington life in the days of Webster, Clay, and John Quincy Adams. The author's sympathy for Calhoun is catching. The reader feels that here is a man who went down fighting for a cause he knew could not hold out against the cry of the Northern reformer. A lengthy bibliography will be found at the end of the book; the photographs and the index are good. (W. J. Lyons, C. S. C.)

Treaty of Paris of 1783: The First Fruits of Franco-American Cooperation. [Publications of the Department of Politics, Catholic University of America.] (Privately printed, Washington, D. C., 1935, pp. 44.) This volume contains the addresses in commemoration of the sesquicentennial of the signing of the treaty which were delivered at Catholic University, Nov. 20, 1933. There is given an account of the University celebration, after which are printed the following papers: "Antecedents of the Treaty," by Dr. John J. Meng; "Significance of the Treaty," by Dr. Elizabeth S. Kite; and "The Treaty and Franco-American Cooperation," by André de Laboulaye. There is appended a letter concerning the event sent by Dr. James Brown Scott.

VAN DEN EYNDE, DAMIEN, O. F. M., *Les normes de l'enseignement chrétien dans la littérature patristique des trois premiers siècles.* (Paris, Gabalda et Fils, Editeurs, 1933, pp. xxviii, 359, 50 fr.) The unity of faith between the "little flock" that made up the early Christian community and the world-wide society that today claims to be the true Church of Christ has been, since the time of the Protestant Reformation especially, a question of supreme importance in the field of Apologetics. For the "reform" envisaged by the leaders of that movement was, according to the Protestant view, a return to the teachings of primitive Christianity from which, they maintained, the Church of Rome had departed in the course of the ages. This departure, so it has been held, led to innovations not only in the organization of the society established by Christ but also in its doctrinal tenets. The controversy, which is still very much alive despite the spread of Rationalism and religious indifference, centers on the respective rôles of Scripture and Tradition in determining the content of faith, and involves of necessity the teaching authority of the Church. Dr. Van den Eynde's dissertation, which he presented to the Faculty of Theology of the Catholic University of Louvain, furnishes us with a scholarly treatment of the problem based on an exhaustive study of the patristic literature that has come down to us from the first three centuries. The work is divided into two parts: the first dealing with the Apostolic Fathers and the early Apologists (up to about 190 A. D.), and the second with the ecclesiastical writers of the third century (190 to 300 A. D.).

The topics investigated in the first part include the attitude of the Fathers towards the Old Testament; the authority of the Hebrew Prophets, of Christ, and of the Apostles; the *Logia Jesu*; the connotation of the word *Evangelium*; the significance of gnosis and of the other charismata; the apostolic succession; and the teaching of the Churches. The author's conclusion with regard to these early Fathers is that for them

the problem of Scripture and Tradition was reduced to that of the Law and the Gospel. In their view, the teaching of the Prophets was identified with the Scriptures and that of Christ and the Apostles with the doctrine handed down from the first announcement of the "glad tidings." The greater weight assigned to Tradition, to the words of Christ and His Apostles, handed down orally or committed to writing by the Apostles and others, follows naturally from the repective rôles assigned to the Old Dispensation and the New. In matters of doctrine, the supreme authority was none other than the Church.

The second period reveals a continuation of the same conviction. It is still the Church that teaches, preserving intact the deposit of Christian truth and communicating it to the faithful. New difficulties arose for the Church in those days in the form of heresies of various kinds, and it was incumbent upon the Christian leaders to define more precisely what was and what was not the teaching of Christ; but in so doing they do not depart from the norms of faith laid down by their predecessors. Scripture is still definitely subordinated to Tradition which must determine the Canon of the Scriptures and interpret the written word. There is no evidence of any idea of "progress" in the faith. The doctrine of the Church is fixed in its essentials. These conclusions, like those of the first part, are supported by abundant evidence drawn immediately from the writings of the Fathers and from the studies of a host of competent scholars. The volume is admirably documented.

Dr. Van den Eynde and the university he represents are to be congratulated upon the publication of this work which is a valuable addition to the literature of Christian Apologetics. (EDWARD B. JORDAN.)

VINACKE, H. M., *History of the Far East in Modern Times.* (New York, F. S. Crofts, 1933, pp. xiv, 503.) This volume is a revised edition of a book previously published by Messrs. Knopf in the Borzoi Series. In commenting upon the previous issue certain mistakes were indicated on pages 4, 31, 148. The paragraph on page 31 of the previous edition remains unaltered. This dealt with the Hoppo, who was frequently called "the Emperor's Merchant." The word Hoppo has no such meaning and should be Hu-Pu. The first character is the 63d radical and has according to pronunciation six different meanings. Pu is the old character still used to designate office. The Hu Pu was the superintendent of customs. The word here used, "Hoppo," is a corruption of the correct term. The author has changed the mistake of the former editions (p. 148) but does not yet make plain that Jung-Lu was a Manchu and a relative of the Dowager Empress Yehonala, and hence could not be a blood brother of Yuan-Shih-Kai.

The preface contains a paragraph on its 2nd page saying that "the streams of Japanese and Chinese History ran in separate channels, until the struggle over Korea caused them to converge." If the author means this as regards the period more especially dealt within this revised volume, the sentence might be allowed to pass, but if it is suggested as a general historical indication of Chinese and Japanese contacts, it is incorrect. For Japan invaded Korea under Hideyoshi in the 16th century and China with the aid of Korea attempted the invasion of Japan under Genghiz Khan; while the history of Formosa, the Liu Chiu Islands, bears witness to the endless complaints of piracy—attacks on towns for many years, and it was through Korea that Buddhism entered Japan from China. There is a confusion over what has happened to Chapter XX. The original title was "The Far Eastern Republic of Siberia," which was to be replaced (*vide* preface) by one on "Russia in the Far East." The old title appears, though two subsections are renamed.

Generally the book is not an improvement on the previous editions, and in this view one is confirmed by the curiously meager treatment of the Lytton Report on the Manchurian Incident of September 1931. This is especially remarkable as the author's book is dated September 1933, two years after the railroad incident which led to the creation of Manchukuo. Indeed the Lytton Report is not found in the index; but a hunt under the League of Nations found it carefully hiding there. The volume appears to suffer from publishers' parsimony, which is unfair to the author and renders it largely without value to the public. (BOYD CARPENTER.)

WELLER, CHARLES FREDERICK (Ed.), *World Fellowship.* (New York, Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1935, pp. xviii, 986, $3.00.) This book is the record of 242 addresses by 191 spokesmen during the First International Congress of the World Fellowship of Faiths, held at Chicago on the occasion of "the Century of Progress" World's Fair. Catholics as a rule are somewhat shy of participating in such congresses, even as mere listeners, lest they give the impression of favoring some general amalgam of all the religious

beliefs in the world. There is the obvious reason for that prudent attitude in the fact that Christ's divine institution is the one and only solvent of all religious aspirations: the true universal religious society. Nevertheless, occasions such as these do supply a platform from which the Catholic philosophy of life, applied practically to the solution of the problems of life in all their variety and intensity, might be expounded freely and sympathetically by those competent to do so, with important results. One gets the impression from this compilation of a vast reaching out for the light. (WILLIAM FRANKLIN SANDS.)

WILSON, CHARLES MORROW, *Meriwether Lewis of Lewis and Clark.* (New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1934, pp. x, 305, $3.00.) On May 14, 1804, a most romantic expedition left St. Louis to ascend the Missouri River. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark were in command. Their destination was the mouth of the Columbia river. This they reached, and returned to St. Louis.

Charles Morrow Wilson tells that story well, and in an unforgettable way. Lewis he brings before you as "close-lipped, tall, amiable"—a Virginian who first fought "genitives and ablatives" in Professor Tally's Latin Academy at Williamsburg, Virginia, before he was "steady of eye and trigger-finger." From beginning to end Mr. Wilson writes in sober fashion. He does not unduly thrust his hero forward. When Lewis and his companions start their journey the reader lives right in the midst of those men. You see them turn bronze under the sun, you see them unshaved, limping, waving off gnats and mosquitoes, quenching their thirst, and dropping exhausted. In spite of dark moments you watch them dance and hear them laugh. At times they were not merely hungry. On one day but three pheasants were at hand to feed thirty-five persons. You see Indians taking their presents of combs, knives, and looking-glasses which Lewis brought along to win their friendship. Canoes, horses, smoking fires in the distance cross the pages.

Not only does the author impress indelibly Lewis the explorer on the memory, but also Lewis the ill-starred Governor-General of the Louisiana Territory. In this latter position Lewis was stung to the quick by the charges at Washington that he was a thief. He started for Washington to face his accusers. He never met them. He met death instead. Whether or not he killed himself Mr. Wilson leaves the reader to determine. No one can read this book without taking away an increased knowledge of this part of American history. (WM. LYONS, C. S. C.)

WOODWARD, E. L., M. A., *Great Britain and the German Navy.* (Oxford University Press, 1935, pp. 525.) This work gives an account of Anglo-German relations from the latter part of the nineteenth century to the outbreak of the World War. The main thesis of this interesting work, which is based upon British, French, Austrian, and German documents, published by various foreign offices, is that Britain would have come to an understanding with Germany provided the latter did not insist on challenging British naval supremacy. So far the thesis is correct. But the book is really a presentation of British points of view on the development of Anglo-German hostility before the World War. On page 193, the author, quoting Sir Edward Grey, makes it clear that

there was no Anglo-Russian naval agreement concluded before April 1914. However the author mentions on page 382 the exchange of notes between Russia and Great Britain on the subject, November 12-13, 1912. But the author fails to mention the famous Grey-Sazanow conversations held at Balmoral Castle on September 24, 1912, onwards, during which Grey assured the Russian statesman that Britain would blockade Germany in the North Sea, in case of a war in which France and Russia might be involved with Germany; and also stated that Britain would not sign any agreement with Germany by which Britain would be forced to remain neutral in case of such a war (*vide* documents 805 and 810, of *British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914*, Vol. IX, by Gooch and Temperley, London, 1933, pp. 750-759 and 769). Therefore, it is clear that long before 1914, Britain was committed to an anti-German foreign policy, not merely because of naval competition, but also for political reasons of curbing the growing power of Germany on the continent of Europe, and also in order to consolidate the ever-expanding British colonial empire in Africa and Asia through Anglo-French support, as well as the then existing Anglo-Japanese Alliance. In spite of its limitations, this is a very useful volume for students of international politics, especially Anglo-German relations. (TARAKNATH DAS.)

YOUNG, URBAN, C. P. (Tr. and Ed.), *Dominic Barberi in England*. (London, Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1935, pp. 230, 6/—.) Denis Gwynn says in the preface to this short and reverent book that Dominic Barberi has played a part in the conversion of Newman and his disciples second only to Cardinal Wiseman himself. And truly the most precious of these letters, one which cannot be read without a quickening of the heart, is a hitherto unpublished account (in a letter to the Passionist general) of Newman's reception into the Church. Stark in their simplicity, almost untouched by literary grace, these pages reveal the humble greatness of England's apostle—as if one walked into a bare presbytery parlour and saw on the unvarnished walls only a Crucifix. (A. McL.)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

Historicism and Religion. W. R. Inge (*History*, March).
Religion Defined by the Process of History. R. E. E. Harkness (*Social Science*, Spring number).
Histoire de l'Église. Rog. Mols, S. J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, June). Method and bibliography.
The Church and Revolution. T. E. Flynn (*Clergy Review*, April).
Carthusians and Benedictines. Benoit du Moustier (*Pax*, April).
Platonism and Early Christian Thought. G. E. Ganss, S. J. (*Thought*, June).
The Decline of Islam. Hilaire Belloc (*Sign*, May).
Jesuit *versus* Benedictine: a Study in Jesuit Methods. J. C. Hardwick, *Modern Churchman*, April, May).
Christianity to the Edict of Milan. F. J. Badcock (*Church Quarterly Review*, May-June).
Medieval Universities: Children of the Papacy. (*London Times Literary Supplement*, May 2).

How Funds for "Good Causes" were Raised in the Middle Ages. Lilian G. Ping (*Hibbert Journal*, April).

The English, Norman, and French Councils called to deal with the Papal Schism of 1159. Frank Barlow (*English Historical Review*, April).

De ortu et progressu singularum provinciarum Ordinis Fratrum Minorum Capuccinorum (concluded). C. A. Geispolsheim, O. M. Cap. (*Collectanea Franciscana*, April).

An Eastern Christian Sect: the Athinganoi. Joshua Starr (*Harvard Theological Review*, April).

Os Portuguéses na Etiópia. J. De S. Coutinho (*Revista Moderna*, January).

Research Possibilities in the Cultural History of Spanish America. J. T. Lanning (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, May).

Conversión en Piritu. Mary Watters (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, May).

Mother Marianne, Heroine of Molokai. Edythe H. Brone (*America*, April 18).

EUROPEAN

La Universidad española en la Edad media y en el Renacimiento. A. J. Fraud (*Revista Hispánica Moderno*, April).

Los sucesos de Aragón del tiempo de Felipe II. Andrés Giménez Soler (*Universidad*, January, February, March).

Joan of Arc in English and American Literature. Helen H. Salls (*South Atlantic Quarterly*, April).

The Archbishop Fénelon. J. A. Dale (*London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, April).

Hildesheim and Bernward: Cultural Progress in the "Dark" Centuries. F. J. Tschan (*Thought*, June).

The Enigma of Erasmus, 1466-1536. W. P. MacDonagh (*Month*, June).

The Bourgeoisie of Geneva in the Age of the Reformation. A. E. Sayous (*Economic History Review*, April).

A Great Dutch Convert [Jan Toorop]. Kees van Hoek (*Columbia*, June).

Fra Agostino Maria Neuroni da Lugano, Vescovo di Como (continued). Enrico Maspoli (*Collectanea Franciscana*, April).

La civiltà di un comune medievale italiano. Luigi Chiappelli (*Archivio Storico Italiano*, 1936, vol. I).

Sant Llorenç de Brindis, apologista de l'Església Catòlica contra el Luteranisme. P. Doroteu de Villalba (*Estudis Franciscans*, June).

BRITISH EMPIRE

Rewriting English History. Hilaire Belloc (*Commonweal*, April 17).

Saint Thomas More and Christian Education. Hugh Graham (*Thought*, June).

Thomás More en las epistolas de Erasmo. R. G. Villoslada (*Razón y Fe*, June).

Early Catholic Periodicals in England. Denis Gwynn (*Dublin Review*, April).

Formularies of Faith during the Reign of Henry VIII. G. Constant (*Downside Review*, April).

Monastic Granges in Yorkshire. T. A. M. Bishop (*English Historical Review*, April).

Episcopal Succession of Ross in the Fifteenth Century. M. A. Canon Kiely (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, June).

Saint Werburga, Patroness of Chester. W. P. Sears, Jr. (*Lamp*, June).

A Sister of Archbishop Cranmer. Geoffrey Baskerville (*English Historical Review*, April). Elected prioress of the Benedictine house of Minster in Sheppey and identical with sacrist of Stixwould, 1525.

The White Monks of Melrose: a Famous Abbey's Rise and Decline. George Burnett (*Scots Magazine*, May).

Irish Culture, Christian and Pagan (concluded). A. I. Rorke (*Truth*, June).

The Popes and Ireland. R. R. M. Hitchcock (*Churchman*, April).

Irish in the Danish and Pre-Norman Period. E. Cahill, S. J. (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, May).

The Sacred Tenth, X. E. J. Quigley, P. P. (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, June).

Anglo-Norman Dublin and Diocese, XIII. M. V. Ronan (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, May).

Cardinal Newman and the *Dublin Review*. Henry Tristram, Cong. Orat. (*Dublin Review*, April).

The Conversion of Wales. J. T. F. Williams (*Month*, March).

John Bede Polding, VIII. J. J. McGovern (*Australasian Catholic Record*, April).

The Beginnings of Historical Criticism in Canada: a Retrospect, 1896-1936. G. M. Wrong (*Canadian Historical Review*, March).

Changing Quebec. Marius Barbeau (*University of Toronto Quarterly*, April).

UNITED STATES

Poor Clares in America. Arsenius Boyer (*Voice*, May).

L'apôtre des Micmacs (concluded). Albert David (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, January-March). Abbé Pierre Maillard.

Irish in New England before 1700. D. L. Jacobus (*New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, April).

Education and Irish Teachers in Early Kentucky. R. J. Purcell (*Catholic Educational Review*, June).

A Kentucky Contribution to Religion on the Frontier. T. F. O'Connor (*Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society*, April). The Sisters of Loretto.

The Conquest of Vincennes. Fintan Walker (*Commonweal*, May 22).

Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, 1836-1936. Sr. M. Lucida (*Quarterly Bulletin of the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae*, March).

Milwaukee's First Mass. P. L. Johnson (*Salesianum*, April).

Father Jacobo Sedelmayr, S. J. Hazel E. Mills (*Arizona Historical Review*, January). "A forgotten chapter in Arizona history."

Church and State in New Mexico, 1610-1650 (continued). F. V. Scholes (*New Mexico Historical Review*, April).

Peter Heylyn's Cosmography of New Mexico. H. O. Brayer (*New Mexico Historical Review*, April).

Monseigneur Le Berger: Bishop Odin's Labors in Early Texas. John Chapman (*Southwest Review*, Autumn, 1935).

Edward Douglas White, Sr., Governor of Louisiana, 1835-1839. Diedrich Ramke (*Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, April).

Knight of the Old South. Richard Reid (*Columbia*, May). James Ryder Randall, author of "Maryland, My Maryland."

Religion among the Flatheads. T. C. Elliott (*Oregon Historical Quarterly*, March).

Memoirs of Lurana Mary Francis, Mother Foundress of the Franciscan Sisters of the Atonement (continued). E. U. Lee (*Lamp*, April, May, June).

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here does not preclude extended notice in the REVIEW*)

Abercrombie, Nibel, *The Origins of Jansenism* (New York: Oxford [Clarendon Press], 1936, pp. xii, 341, $12.50).

Alcaniz, A Florentino, J. A., *De autographo tractatus inediti Card. Joannis de Lugo De Anima* (Madrid: Estudios Eclesiasticos Lagasca, 1936, pp. 15, 191).

Anonymous, *Hitler et Rosenberg le Vrai Visage du National-Socialisme* (Paris: La Bonne Presse, 1936, pp. 161).

Baudrillart, *Le Cardinal, Pie XI et la Presse Actes Pontificaux: 1922-1936* (Collection "Documentation Catholique," 5 rue Bayard, 1936, pp. xvii, 334).

Belleney, Joseph, *Sainte Bernadette Bergere en Chretiente* (Paris: La Bonne Presse, 1936, pp. 204).

Black, J. B., *The Reign of Elizabeth 1550-1603* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1936, pp. vii, 448 and maps, $5.00).

Boeren, P. C., *Étude sur les tributaires d'aglise dans dc Comte de Flandre du IXe siecle* (Amsterdam, Holland: J. J. Paris, 1936, pp. xxvi, 184).

Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report 1934-1935* (Ottawa: J. F. Kenny, Treas., 1936, pp. 73).

Case, Lynn M., *French Opinion on the United States and Mexico 1860-1867* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936, pp. xxiii, 452, $7.00).

David, Charles Wendall, *De Expugnatione Lybonensi: The Conquest of Lisbon* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936, pp. xxi, 201, $3.75).

Davidson, Elizabeth H., *Establishment of the English Church in Continental American Colonies* [Historical Papers of the Trinity College Historical Society. Series XX.] (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1936, pp. 94, $1.00).

Dolger, Dr. Franz, *Antike und Christentum Kultur und Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, Band V: Heft 2 (Munster i/W: Aschendlrffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936, pp. 152, 3.75 RM.).

Ensor, R. D. K., *England 1870-1914* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1936, pp. xxiii, 634 with maps).

Fessard, G., *Pax Nostra: Examen de conscience international* (Paris: Editions Bernard Grasset, 1936, pp. xx, 460).

Bregersen, *Halfdan, Ibsen and Spain* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936, pp. xvi, 209, $2.50).

Glasgow, Maude, *The Scotch-Irish in Northern Ireland and the American Colonies* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1936, pp. 345, $3.00).

Grussi, Rev. A. M., *Chief Mitigomish* (Boston: Christopher Pub. House, 1936, pp. 237, $2.00).

Hamilton, Earl J., *Money, Prices, and Wages in Valencia, Aragon, and Navarre 1351-1500* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936, pp. xxvii, 310, $4.50).

Heusinger, Edward, *Early Explorations and Mission Establishments in Texas* (San Antonio, Texas: The Naylor Co., 1936, pp. xvi, 222, $2.50).

Hodgen, Margaret, *The Doctrine of Survivals* (London: Allenson & Co., 1936, pp. 192, 5/ net).

Hubbart, Henry C., *The Older Middle West 1840-1880* (New York: D. Appleton-Century for the American Historical Association, 1936, pp. ix, 305, $3.50).

Koesters, Ludwig, S. J., *Die Kirche unseres Glaubens Eine theologische Grundlegung katholischer Weltanschauug* (Freiburg i/B: Herder & Co., 1936, pp. x, 264, $2.40).

Lecleve, Louis, *Sainte Angele de Foligno sa Vie Ses Oeuvres* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1936, pp. 242).

Madoz, P. Jose, S. I., *El Conmonitorio de San Vicente de Lerins* (Madrid, Spain: Edisiones A. B. F., 1935, pp. 150).

McAllister, Anna, *Ellen Ewing Wife of General Sherman* (New York: Benziger Bros., 1936, pp. xiv, 379, $3.50).

——, *Un Saint pour chaque jour du Mois-Mars* (Paris: Maison de la Bonne Press, 1936, pp. 258).

Malengreau, Guy, *L'Esprit Particulariste La Revolution des Pays-Bas au XVIe* (Louvain: Bibliotheque de l'Universite, 1936, pp. 228, $2.25).

Mattingly, Sister Mary Ramona, *The Catholic Church on the Kentucky Frontier: 1785-1812* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1936, pp. viii, 235).

Mayo, Lawrence, Editor, Hutchinson's *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay*, Volumes I, II, III (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936, pp. 1321, $15.00 for the set).

Miller, Rene Fulop, *Leo XIII und unsere Zeit Macht der Kirche—Gewalten der Welt* (Zurich und Leipzig: Rascher Verlag, 1935, pp. 215).

Nute, Grand Lee and Ackermann, Gertrude W., *Guide to the personal papers in the Manuscript Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society* (St. Paul: Minn. Historical Society, 1935, pp. x, 146, $1.25).

O'Neill, Edward H., *A History of American Biography 1800-1935* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1935, pp. xi, 428, $4.00).

Pace, Edward; Walsh, J. J.; Guilday, Peter; Wynne, J. J.; Kelly, Blanche, with the Associate Editors and Revisers, *The Catholic Encyclopedia* [Shahan Memorial Edition Vol. I A-ARG.] (New York: Gilmary Society, Inc., 1936, pp. xxii, 800).

Parsons, Wilfrid, *Mexican Martyrdom* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1936, pp. vi, 304, $2.50).

Ryan, E. A., S. J., *The Historical Scholarship of Saint Bellarmine* (New York, Fordham University Press, 1936, pp. xiv, 226).

Schwegler, Dr. P. Theodor, O. S. B., *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche der Schweiz* (Schlieren-Zurich: Verlagsanstalt Neue Brucke, 1935, pp. 285).

Temperley, Harold, *England and the Near East—The Crimea* (New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1936, pp. xxviii, 548).

Thomas, Sister M. Evangeline, *Nativism in the Old Northwest, 1850-1860* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1936, pp. vii, 270).

Weelen, Jean-Edmond, *Rochambeau Father and Son* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1936, pp. xvii, 285, $3.00).

Wild, John, *George Berkeley: A Study of His Life and Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936, pp. ix, 552, $6.00).

Williams, A. Lukyn, D. D., *Adversus Judaeos* (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1936, pp. xvii, 428, $9.00).

Wirth, Fremont P., *The Development of America* (New York: American Book Company, 1936, pp. x, 772, lxviii).

Wyckoff, Vertrees J., *Tobacco Regulation in Colonial Maryland* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936, pp. 228, $2.25).

CONTRIBUTORS OF ARTICLES AND MISCELLANY

Rev. LEO HICKS, S. J., who is continuing the work of the late Rev. John Hungerford Pollen, S. J., resides in Farm Street, Berkeley Square, London.

MARSHALL W. BALDWIN, Ph. D., is assistant-professor of history in New York University.

Rev. Dr. ROBERT HOWARD LORD is vice-rector and professor of Church history in Saint John's Seminary, Brighton, Massachusetts.

GEORGE N. SHUSTER, Litt. D., is the managing-editor of *Commonweal*.